NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME VII.---NO. 41. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1847. WHOLE NUMBER 353.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—One Dollar per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Communications.

CONVENTION AT WEST WINFIELD.

The Convention was organized February 12, at 10 o'clock, A. M. by the appointment of James Eaton, Jr. President, and E. D. Hudson, Secretary.

A Business Committee was appointed, consisting of C. L. Remond, E. D. Hudson, Hannah Bucklin, Amanda Harding, and W. W. Brown.

The preliminaries being arranged the Convention adjourned to half-past one o'clock, P. M. when the Committee reported the following resolutions:

Resolved, That as man is the creature of God, and must answer to him for his deeds, no human creations, societies, or organizations, civil or religious, can absolve or screen him from his full measure of accountability.

Resolved, That it is not only the right of the citizens, but an absolute duty to refuse to obey all human enactments which conflict with the laws of God; and the doctrine, so rife in our land, that we are not to question the acts of our rulers even when they require us to do injustice, but are bound to "obey the powers that be," is the doctrine of despotism, to which no FREEMAN will submit.

Resolved, That the principle advocated by the American Church and clergy, that Slavery is not sinful, *per se*—that man may hold his brother man as an article of property, a beast of burden, for the good of the latter—that because the law sanctions Slavery and interposes in its behalf, therefore the Church is entirely justified in allowing its members to hold slaves, and absolves the Church from guilt in the matter—affords clear and incontrovertible evidence that the Church and clergy of these United States, have apostatized, and as a body ceased to be the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, and have substituted the laws of man and the cup of devils, for the laws of God and the cup of the Lord.

Resolved, That the refusal of the trustees of the Methodist and Baptist churches in West Winfield to open their doors to the cause of the enslaved, is another and conclusive proof of their sympathy with the oppressor and their accomplices in the North, and entitling them to the company of the "Brotherhood of Thieves."

The above resolutions were discussed during a three-days meeting, held in the academy in West Winfield, and the Congregational meeting-house in East Winfield, by Messrs. Brown, Hudson, and Remond, also David Cushman, of Exeter, and Mr. Raymond, of Cedarville.

The subjects of the Constitution, Liberty party, and Mexican war, were fully and animatingly discussed.

A Central New-York Anti-Slavery Convention was regularly organized, to convene annually, in connection with the Ladies' Anti-Slavery Fair, and appointed the following officers, to wit;

S. A. GREEN, *President.*

MRS. D. THOMAS, W. Winfield,
RANDOLPH HODGES, do.
ISAAC BUCKLIN, Jr., do.
LAURA TURNER, Bridgewater,
CURTIS RIDER, Litchfield,
H. L. EASTON, Cedarville,
} *Vice Presidents.*

Mrs. M. A. E. Green, *Secretary.*

L. G. Thomas, *Treasurer.*

Executive Committee, in addition to the above officers:

J. Bisby, James Eaton, Jr. Hannah Bucklin, Mrs. Sarah Guild, Emeline Murdock, Erastus Guild.

On Friday, P. M. the Convention adjourned to the Washingtonian Hall, kept by L. G. Thomas, to attend the Ladies' Fair which had been resumed—and the soiree which closed the Fair—where addresses were made by Dr. Hudson and W. W. Brown.

The Convention adjourned on Sunday to such time as the Executive Committee should appoint.

M. A. E. GREEN, *Secretary.*

WEST WINFIELD, Feb. 16, 1847.

CAZENOVIA ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

Agreeable to a call, an Anti-Slavery Convention was held in the free Church in Cazenovia, February 16th, at ten o'clock, A. M.

On motion of J. C. Hathaway, of Farmington, the Convention was organized by calling James C. Springstead to the chair, and the appointment of N. Cuykendall, as secretary pro tempore.

On motion of Charles Lenox Remond, of Massachusetts, opportunity was offered for prayer. On motion of Mr. Remond, J. C. Hathaway, E. D. Hudson, from Massachusetts, Henry Van Driesen, Mary Springstead, and Wm. Burroughs, were appointed a Business Committee.

On motion of J. C. Hathaway, C. L. Remond, Peter De Clercq, J. Springstead, were appointed a committee to nominate officers. The Convention was then entertained with general remarks from C. L. Remond and J. Hathaway, after which the Convention adjourned to half-past one o'clock, P. M.

Afternoon Session.—Opportunity was offered for prayer.

C. L. Remond reported the following list of officers for the Convention, to wit: [Accepted.

PETER DE CLERCQ, *President.*

J. C. SPRINGSTEAD,
O. H. GILBERT,
} *Vice Presidents.*

MARY SPRINGSTEAD, *Secretary.*

J. C. Hathaway for the Business Committee, reported the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the germ of the Anti-Slavery enterprise is a positive principle of right, the "Christian Standard,"—the "royal law,"—"self-evident truth,"—and that American Slavery when tested by such a principle, is proved to be a sin of the grossest character, and slaveholders the chiefest of sinners.

Whereas, the American Church and clergy, by fellowshipping slaveholders as Christians, prove themselves to be guilty of the most "damnable heresy" and practical immorality of the grossest kind; therefore

2. Resolved, That those "who fear God and regard man" are loudly called upon to "come out" from all such unholy alliances, as from anti-Christ.

Whereas, in the language of James G. Birney, "the American Church is the bulwark of American Slavery," and whereas, the great mass of Liberty party men, in common with Whigs and Democrats, are either directly or indirectly fellowshipping slaveholders as Christians, thereby making themselves a part of said bulwark; and whereas, in the very nature of the case, a political organization can only take cognizance of a man's political relations and duties; therefore

3. Resolved, That the Liberty party is not justly entitled to the name of anti-slavery, and is unworthy the confidence of the people as such.

Whereas, the Constitution of these United States being a slaveholding compromise—"a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," "with which humanity and religion had nothing to do;" and whereas, this covenant is a *bond*—an instrument of authority for every member of the United States Government, the "supreme law of the land;" and whereas, the American Union is a union of thieves, robbers, and pirates,—the vital and animating spirit of which has been, and still is, the propagation, protection, and perpetuation of man-stealing, slave-breeding, slave-holding, and slave-trading; therefore,

6. Resolved, That "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS" is the only rational, scriptural, and legitimate principle of every true friend of the slave, and the only peaceful and efficient remedy for American Slavery. [Accepted.

Joseph C. Hathaway opened the discussion on the first resolution, as embodying the principles of Old Organizationists, in refutation of the charges so commonly preferred against them, that they were "Infidels," "non-resistants," "woman's rights," and disorganizationists—and though we might be associated with infidels in the cause of bleeding humanity, we by no means endorsed, or became responsible for their infidel sentiments thereby, and forcibly contrasted infidel humanity, with Christian inhumanity!

Dr. Hudson followed Mr. Hathaway, and vindicated our enterprise as Christian—that all slaveholding was sinful per se—originating and being perpetuated with a spirit of selfishness—of anti-Christ, which was always opposed to the spirit of Christ—and that we could not separate the sin of Slavery from the sinner, the slaveholder, who was, from the beginning to the end of his slaveholding, "a man-stealer," a sinner of the first rank"—and every moment while a slaveholder was guilty of a violation of every command in the decalogue, and every principle of Christianity. That it was impossible for one possessed of the spirit of Christ, to hold his brother or sister as a beast of burden, a chattel. This he maintained in opposition to their ecclesiastical and Christian accomplices, the ministers and churches throughout the North, who maintained that they might be Christians and still be slaveholders. B. Borden then arose, and wished exceptions to be made—that *all* churches were not slaveholding. Dr. H. remarked that there were exceptions to all general rules, and those who were exceptions truly, were not troubled if the exceptions were not expressed. Mr. Remond remarked that exceptions would take care of themselves.

Mr. W. W. Brown then read the following article from the "Liberty Press," by Mr. Murch, and gave notice that he should substantiate his positions, and fulfil his promise. Mr. Murch said he would be present, and if, *in his view*, Mr B. made good his statements, then he would withdraw his confidence from such editors and Liberty party men. Mr. B. proposed to submit it to the audience if he did or did not make good his positions—that Liberty party men had gone to Mexico to fight the battles of Slavery, and Liberty party editors were reiterating the cry of "Our country right or wrong," from which Mr. Murch (*being prompted*), dissented. He would be judge, and would mark him and follow him as a liar, unless his own mind was fully convinced. Mr. Phillips, (editor of the Whig,) hoped the discussion would be fully entered into, as the Liberty party had sent for their *big gun*, S. R. Ward, to defend the party. He believed that Mr. Murch, by his one vote, had done more hurt, than he could do good in forty years. *Several voices* declaring that Old Organizationists were Whigs, because Whigs endorsed us. Mr. Hathaway remarked that extremes sometimes meet, and had now, thought there were no class of men more widely at variance than Mr. P. and ourselves. E. D. Hudson remarked, that he had no objection to wicked men meeting us and endorsing what was right. The devil once met Jesus Christ and endorsed him. (Laughter.)

The Convention adjourned till evening.

Evening Session.—Opportunity was offered for prayer. W. W. Brown took the stand, and proceeded to read the letter of Mr. Murch, in the Liberty Press, viz:

For the Liberty Press.

WM. W. BROWN.

The individual whose name heads this article, in company with Charles Lenox Remond, of Massachusetts, lectured in this village last evening. These gentlemen, it is well known, are Abolitionists of the Garrisonian school.

Mr. Brown in the course of his remarks, after administering a just and merited rebuke to C. M. Clay for preaching one thing, and practising another; and to the Whig party, for their wide-mouthed hypocrisy in denouncing the Mexican War, and going to fight its battles, said: "And I am sorry to say that some of our Liberty party friends have buckled on their knapsacks, and gone to fight the battles of Slavery; and Liberty party editors are advocating the impious doctrine, 'My country right or wrong.'"

Now if this statement is correct, let Mr. Brown produce his proof tangible; let him give names and dates. If he knows of Liberty party men who have gone to fight the battles of Slavery, give us their names and places of residence. If he knows of Liberty party papers that have echoed the popular blasphemy, "my country right or wrong," let him show us the paper, the article, the date, that we may be convinced, and we will thank him for the manly expose. But if he does not do this, let him be a marked man. Let the impress which he has written with his own finger, burn and blister on his craven brow. Let him go before the anti-slavery public branded as an enemy to his crushed race. A *base calumniator* of the friends of his wronged brethren, an *unmitigated liar*.

When he will do this, I will retract all the harsh epithets I have used, and withdraw my confidence from such men and such papers. Until he does, I must continue to regard him as a man of doubtful veracity.

A. B. MURCH.

CAZENOVIA, February 4th, 1847.

Mr. Brown remarked that he was a branded man—at the North by Liberty party men, as well as at the South by men-stealers—that he was charged with being "an *unmitigated liar*," — a man of "*doubtful veracity*." He expected no commendation from any one of a slaveholding character, but would proceed to sustain his positions by submitting to the audience his proof, which he brought from Liberty party papers. He was prepared to condemn Liberty party "out of its own mouth." Mr. Brown then read a letter published in the Albany Patriot of July, from William Goodell, as follows:

[*Extract from Mr. Goodell's Letter.*]

This Mexican War that sets the nation agog, and drives even sane men out of their senses, what is to be its effect upon the Liberty party in particular, and upon professed Abolitionists in general—Old Organization, New Organization, and no organization? Whig Abolitionists, deadly enemies of the Liberty party, and commonly sympathizing with Old Organization, have revealed to us *their* latitude, in the ordinary tone of the Whig press, (saving the Tribune and a few others perhaps,) and the pious Governors Slade and Briggs. *They* go with Cassius M. Clay and the American Board, denouncing "the greatest abomination in all the earth," and hugging it to their bosoms—reprobating the Mexican War as "damnable," and crying out "traitor"! "tory"! against the man who hesitates to shoulder his musket and rush into the hottest of the damnation! Just as though it were patriotism and chivalry to defy the living God, and at the bidding of James K. Polk, post on blindfold—no, with eyes wide open! into the perdition of the ungodly! And must I say it? No less than four, out of our upwards of thirty Liberty papers, are shouting to the same chorus, and I know not how many more, hesitant and timid!

Having hinted at "Old Organization," it were but just to award due honour to the *veteran Liberator*—aye, and to the National *Anti-Slavery Standard*. I rejoice to find them "sound to the core" on *this* subject. There are true men yet, in all the broken squadron of Abolitionists, and if the separate organizations, like the old sects and parties, should prove to be "part iron and part clay," new combinations may rise out of them and do the needful—*not* by any such liberalized Anti-Slavery League as some of our Massachusetts and Ohio men are lusting after, that shall conglomerate together all the *talkers* against Slavery, irrespective of their *actions*, but those, on the contrary, who can afford to carry the load of free principles and honest practices, wherever those principles and practices may lead them.

Mr. Brown read extracts from the editorial of the *Cincinnati Herald*, then edited by Dr. Bailey, now editor of the *National Era*, the *national* Liberty party organ—as proof of the sympathy of the editor with one of the greatest man-stealers of our country, engaged in a murderous war against Mexico to enlarge the area of Slavery, and his readiness "to lay down his pen," and go to the rescue of the brave stealer of men; and that the Doctor had no sympathy with the wronged and outraged Mexican against Slavery. Mr. Brown proceeded to read from "*the Liberty Herald*," published in Warren, Ohio—"The *Perry Countryman*," in Perry, New-York—"The *Pittsburgh Mystery*"—"The *American Citizen*," edited by Rev. Dr. Brisbane, Liberty party organ of Pennsylvania—"*Bangor Gazette*," Liberty party organ in Maine—and the "*Campaign Paper*," of the Liberty party of the State of Ohio, edited by the Central Committee of the Liberty party of that State—their defence of the war—of "our country, right or wrong"—that Mexico ought to be punished for her temerity, and admitting that Liberty party men had patriotically shouldered their muskets and marched to Mexico in defence of our country. Mr. Brown remarked, that inasmuch as the thirty Liberty party papers had neglected to expose those editors who had advocated the action of this country in defence, and for the benefit of Slavery; and had not condemned the Liberty party men who have volunteered for this piratical war, they made themselves responsible, and laid themselves open to the charge of endorsing the war,—"our country, right or wrong." He then referred to the recent speech of the Liberty party United States Senator, Mr. Cilley, from New Hampshire, on the Mexican war.

"To withdraw the troops within the frontier; organize and drill them, and get ready to strike a blow for peace, at the next winter. *This was not to be a short war. To prosecute it with success*, we must have an army well drilled and disciplined; our forces must be increased. In his opinion we must have an army of fifty thousand men to do anything." Such are the sentiments of a Liberty party Senator, and nowhere censured by Liberty party papers, while the Liberty party are claiming him as their Liberty party Senator. I'll give you a problem to solve. If such is the abolition theory and practice of one Liberty party Senator, how many Liberty party Senators would it take to abolish Slavery?

Mr. A. B. Murch came forward in great confusion of face, and said he was ignorant of the position of such papers, and the conduct of certain Liberty party men. The extracts read by Mr. Brown were startling. He had entertained the idea that Liberty party men were actuated by a moral principle which recognized the brotherhood of mankind. Inasmuch as the extracts were cut from papers, and Mr. Brown had not brought forward the identical paper to sustain his charges, he was not prepared to take back what he had said of Mr. Brown. He found these to be the republished extracts, in the Liberator, and could not rely upon them. We would send them to the Liberty Press, if Mr. B. would give them to him, and if the Press refused to publish them, and neglected to show them to be false, he would then rely upon their truthfulness. Mr. Brown here presented Mr. Murch with the extracts, which twice confounded him.

Dr. Hudson presented the following resolution, to wit:

"That in the opinion of this meeting, William W. Brown has fully sustained his positions, that Liberty party men have engaged in the Mexican war and that several Liberty party presses are reiterating the cry of the Whig and Democratic parties, "our country right or wrong."

S. R. Ward being called for, came forward and said that he was prepared to vote for the resolution; that the charges of Mr. Brown were true, but he wished to say that Mr. Curtis, editor of the Perry Countryman, had been cashiered for his defence of the Mexican war, and that Dr. Brisbane was educated in the school of Slavery, which fact would serve as some apology for him. His paper, however, was languishing for want of support because of his advocacy of the war. He did n't know that Dr. B. had assumed such a position till on his way to this Convention.

Dr. Hudson's resolution, in justification of Mr. Brown, was adopted almost unanimously.

The Convention adjourned till ten o'clock, A. M. on Wednesday.

Second day, ten o'clock, A. M.—Convention was called to order by O. H. Gilbert, Vice-President. S. R. Ward opened the exercises, by prayer. J. C. Hathaway commenced the discussion on the third resolution relating to the position of the Liberty party, in connection with the Whigs and Democrats, in sustaining the "bulwark of Slavery," thereby rendering it unworthy the name of Anti-Slavery, and the confidence of the people. Mr. Hathaway remarked on the influence of a politico-sectarian spirit on the conduct of men to close their eyes and stop their ears to the truth, and that Liberty party men exhibited this same spirit in an enlarged degree, in their opposition to free discussion, efforts to suppress the truth, and very great sensitiveness when the truth is uttered, which conflicts with their party. This is a sign of something rotten in Denmark. No honest man, or body of men, will ever assume a position and maintain it at the expense of truth. The Liberty party being a political organization, cannot look after the whole life of its members, relating to Slavery; and hence, can with no more propriety be called Anti-Slavery, than that society taking to itself the appellation of temperance, that from the very nature of its organization cannot look after the whole life of its members relating to entire abstinence from all intoxicating drinks. While Liberty party men admit that "the American Church is the bulwark of American Slavery," no honest man will presume to deny that that bulwark receives the countenance and efficient support of Liberty party. On the contrary, the American Anti-Slavery Society takes cognizance of the whole life of its members, touching Slavery. Let me be called "Infidel" by the Church, but never the enemy of the slave or God's poor children.

S. R. Ward said there was much discussion on this question at this time, in the Liberty party Conventions, and some progress was evinced by members of the party on this Church question. Many Liberty party men in this vicinity are seeing their inconsistent positions in the bulwark of Slavery, and are coming out and forming independent churches. He rejoiced to hear the scathing remarks of friend Hathaway, on the Liberty party, touching its slaveholding relation in the Church. Liberty party is inconsistent, highly so—was glad to have it lashed—it justly merited the rebukes of friend Hathaway. He confessed, the mass of Liberty party men were in the Church, and were slaveholding. He would vote for the resolution, save that clause which declared it not Anti-Slavery, and unworthy the confidence of the people.

J. C. Hathaway remarked that the Liberty party, by the gentleman's own confession, was not Anti-Slavery—it was sustaining the "bulwark" of the slave system, and it was necessarily false to the slave. It was only a political organization, and as such, could not take cognizance of the conduct of its members out of the party. That Liberty party endorses the Anti-Slavery character of its members, who belong to "the brotherhood of thieves," if they only vote the Liberty ticket. The American Society recognizes no man as Anti-Slavery who will not live his Anti-Slavery principles everywhere.—[Adjourned.

Afternoon Session.—Francis Hawley opened the Convention with prayer.

Mr. *Bates* resumed the discussion on the *third resolution*, relating to Liberty party. Mr. Bates said that the representatives of the American Society appeared in bad light, in coming here to reprove Liberty party, while the American Society admitted Whigs and Democrats. Mr. Hathaway gloried in being called an Infidel. What is it to be an Infidel? but to deny God, Jesus Christ, and his word? The Liberty party was not organized for any other purpose than political effect. Is not Slavery the creature of law, and sustained by law, and must it not be abolished by legislative action? Suppose all men, from Maine to Texas, were convinced of the sinfulness and inexpediency of Slavery by moral suasion. What, then? Should we not need legislative action to abolish the system? Slavery must be abolished by legislative enactments, and to do this, Liberty party was organized. It does not take cognizance of a man's position in the Church. I belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church, called pro-slavery. The organization of the party will not allow it to interfere with my church relations. The power of the party consists in numbers, and its object should be to increase its numbers—no matter what their character, or from whence they are derived. The party is not pro-slavery.

Dr. Hudson replied, saying Mr. Bates had condemned the party out of his own mouth. He admitted that Liberty men were in pro-slavery churches, and that the organization of the party would not allow of any interference with such a sinful, slaveholding relation. The leading Liberty party men, J. G. Birney at their head, had declared "the American Church to be the bulwark of American Slavery," and demonstrated the charge; and still the mass of the party persists in maintaining their union with thieves, robbers, adulterers, and sinners of the first rank, and their accomplices in the Church, and ecclesiastical bodies, which render a far more efficient support to the system of Slavery, than anything else in the wide world. Mr. Bates admits himself to be a member of a man-stealing church, which sells the image of God, Jesus Christ, in the person of the poor slave; and yet talks about "infidelity." Why, he is a practical Atheist. The Liberty party will apply its principle to members of the Whig and Democratic parties, and disfellowship them as no friend of God or man, while the party will unite with these very same slaveholding Whigs and Democrats *in the Church*, and there sanctify American Slavery, and embosom the worst of thieves, and support slaveholding priests, "who divine lies for hire," saying, "thus, saith the Lord when the Lord hath not spoken." The history of Slavery proves it, not the creature of law, and not sustained by laws, but a creature of a slave-creating spirit, and sustained by that same spirit. This spirit creates the law to regulate Slavery. This law has no vitality nor power, when the spirit that created it is dead. Public opinion is the law of this land, and is what sustains Slavery, and what must abolish it, if done by peaceful means and influences within this nation. When the spirit that created Slavery and sustains it is dead, Slavery dies, and freedom revives and lives. When public opinion is Anti-Slavery, Slavery goes to its place, legislation or no legislation. "We, the people, are the fountain of power"—we, the people, keep Slavery in existence. When the people are converted, they will, "*cease to do evil*," to support Slavery anywhere, and as a legitimate consequence, Slavery will cease. Now, who moulds and manufactures public opinion? From whom do the people derive their first lessons, for slavery or liberty? From the American Church and clergy—their religious influences give tone to the public mind. *Albert Barnes* says, "that will be a slow work of reformation which shall be undertaken against anything that has the sanction of the Church," "while yet no one can doubt that the Church of Christ in this land, has power to revolutionize the whole public sentiment on the subject, (of *Slavery*,) and the hour when the United States and their territories, the habitation of the slave shall fall"! If this be true, and no man can doubt it, then the American Church is the bulwark of Slavery—creates and keeps alive the spirit of Slavery, and the Liberty party, in sustaining that bulwark, is condemned as not Anti-Slavery, by the practical application of its own principle, by which it condemns those who vote for Slavery. Then the Liberty party, in sustaining the American Church, gives the most effectual support to the slave system—holds up, and efficiently supports, what it pretends to desire to abolish, through a political organization. Is it entitled to the name of Anti-Slavery, or the confidence of the people?

S. R. Ward remarked that Mr. Hathaway said that the American Society took cognizance of the whole life of its members, and scathed them when they proved false to the slave. He would say that the same credit was due to some members of the Liberty party; he thought that the American Society had members in it who were false to the slave, and if it endorsed them, then they were guilty as well as Liberty party men. The Liberty party was not organized for *Church reform*. If it had been, then it would be in a pro-slavery position. It was organized independent of the Church question; it was originated for political purposes.

Mr. Bates (Liberty party man) interrupted Mr. Ward, and said he was a member of the Methodist Church; it was Anti-Slavery—but whether so or not, the party could take no cognizance of his church relations. Mr. Ward resumed his remarks, giving the Methodist Church a blow: saying that it had never declared slaveholding to be sinful, and called in question the Christian character of Bishop Andrew, or any of its slaveholding Priests or church members—that while Liberty party takes cognizance only of the political duties of men, and any one can vote the Liberty ticket, still he admitted that the mass of the Liberty party men belonged to the bulwark of Slavery, and were in a paradoxical position.

The Church question was first commenced by the Liberty party in this county, and was progressing.

E. D. Hudson said, that any one professing to be a friend to the slave, who subscribed to the principles of the American Society, and was not a slaveholder, the Society received, as a member, on his profession; but the Society interpreted and applied its own principles, and any person who proved recreant to the slave, was rebuked and condemned by the Society in its stringent resolutions, which amounted to excommunication. That it was not true that the Liberty party originated for political purposes; it originated to accommodate the bulwark of Slavery, against which Garrison and his coadjutors were applying their moral battering-ram; and that the Liberty party men had been loud in their cries from their bulwarks, of "anti-church," "anti-clergy," and that Liberty party had been composed mainly of the virtually excommunicated members of the American Society, who could n't stand the test of their own professed principles. He admitted that some were now seeing the error of their past conduct, and were now standing by the side of Garrison on the Church question, and those whom they formerly stigmatized as infidel, and were now receiving to themselves the same epithets—such as Goodell, Smith, &c.

The Liberty party has no moral principle. It is a political party, governed by the spirit of accommodation, expediency; hence, it accommodates a pro-slavery Church to get votes, as Samuel Lewis and the Liberty party, of Ohio, did at its last campaign.

S. R. Ward said, that the Liberty party was organized to prevent men from stultifying themselves in voting for slaveholders, under the scattering system. It originated from the necessity of the case. Friends who believed in voting for the slave were obliged to assume such a position. Public opinion, it was thought, was not sufficient to abolish Slavery, without some legislative action. I fully accord with Dr. Hudson, that if the Church becomes right the people will be right that the Church possesses the power to bring Slavery to a speedy termination—that the Church gives tone to public opinion. Liberty party men are feeling very uneasy in their present relations to Slavery. We as a party claim only to embody the political form of Anti-Slavery, and don't pretend to cover the whole ground. I admit that while we nominate Anti-Slavery men, and vote for Anti-Slavery men, yet we sustain the bulwark of the system.

Dr. Rice moved an amendment to insert American Anti-Slavery Society after the words Liberty party; said that there were not half a dozen friends of the old Society here, and most of them were in that Church with Liberty party members. He read the preamble and principles of the American Society, and terms of admission.

C. L. Remond, said that if the American Society was wrong, that did not prove the Liberty party entitled to the credit of being Anti-Slavery. He would ask the mover of the amendment if two wrongs made one right! But the positions of the two Societies were in no way similar. The Liberty party is pro-slavery, the American Society is anti-slavery. The one is in the bulwark of Slavery, the other is branded as a comeouter, disunionist, disorganizing society. Why is it so difficult for us to get a hearing, if our positions are in keeping with Liberty party? What are the positions of Foster, Pillsbury, Phillips, Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and Western New-York Anti-Slavery Society? Are they slaveholding? We ask Liberty party to be consistent in those things, voluntary and passible. I regard the amendment as a Liberty party insult. He would ask the mover if Liberty party went against the Government as now administered? Has it not rather declared that it went "for the Union right or wrong? Slavery in or Slavery out? Texas in or Texas out?" Has not friend Ward admitted that it was in the bulwark of Slavery.

J. C. Hathaway said there were no members of the society who do not live Anti-Slavery, who do not cease to sustain Slavery in Church and State. Those who become members, and who are members of the American Society, believe Slavery to be sinful. What is it to believe? By their life give evidence that they consider Slavery sinful. The American Society takes cognizance of the lives of its members, towards Slavery, and if they prove false, as friend Hudson says, in its strongest resolutions, excommunicate them. So far as we can, we testify against them before God and the world.

Can Liberty party do that? Has it done it? No, it can't, as friend Ward has admitted. Liberty party can represent only one form of Anti-Slavery—the voting form—which, to say the least, is of doubtful character under our present form of government. Still, Liberty party claims to be the embodiment of all true Anti-Slavery, while it repudiates Church Anti-Slavery reform.

The amendment and resolution was laid on the table by a Liberty party vote. The meeting adjourned.

(*To be continued.*)

Selections.

From the Liberator.

INTREPID ACTION AND NARROW ESCAPE.

Our amiable and worthy friend, LORING MOODY, whose residence is in East Boston, performed a very gallant act on Monday afternoon last, at the imminent peril of his life, and much to his bodily injury; and must for some time be confined to his house, in consequence. The following handsome editorial notice of this act appears in the Morning Post of Wednesday, and we believe accurately gives the particulars:—

A NOBLE NON-RESISTANT.—On Monday afternoon, two horses attached to a coach upon runners, without a driver, came dashing along at the top of their speed up the ferry wharf from the Eastern railroad depot, causing the people in the vicinity, among whom were several military gentlemen, to seek shelter in stores and doors to avoid being run over. Several children were playing at the head of the wharf, who seemed in imminent peril of being trampled under foot, when a man started from among those who were looking to their own safety, and placed himself in the road immediately before the horses, with the intention of arresting their progress. On they came at full speed, and every one present thought the man mad who had thus thrown himself before them, especially as the road was covered with ice, which rendered his footing insecure. Nevertheless, he stood his ground nobly, and as the horses dashed upon him, seized one of them by the bridle with such effect that he tripped up and rolled upon the ground, but the man was also thrown down by the shock, and the other horse continued plunging with such force that he drew the sleigh over the man, and then broke the shaft, leaving the carriage still upright on the runners. All danger over, the crowd came to the rescue, and secured the horses and picked up the man, who was lying on the ground almost insensible, with his body badly bruised and his clothes torn. In the carriage was a lady, who had almost fainted with fear, but had sustained no bodily injury. The individual who had thus exposed his life, and thereby had unquestionably saved several children from serious injury, not to speak of the passenger in the coach, was Mr. Loring Moody, a resident of East Boston, a well-known non-resistant. He was taken to the Eastern Exchange Hotel, where medical aid was procured, and subsequently was taken home in a carriage, and is now confined to his bed. Though a strong non-resistant, this act evinces a nobleness of nature that rose above self, where the safety of others was at stake. We regret to state that Mr. Moody is not overburdened with the good things of this life, and as he has a family dependent upon his labours, he can ill afford the loss of time which his generous daring has entailed upon him.

Our readers will be glad to know the sequel of this touching story. The friends are aware, that Mr. Moody's devotion to our cause has left him wholly dependent on his own exertions for support. His dress was entirely destroyed. The lady in the coach was the daughter of Colonel Pierce, of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, reputed to be a very wealthy man. Although close to the spot, he never took the trouble to come near Mr. Moody during the scene; but, a day or two after, waited on him at his house, thanked him for the bold feat, which, he said, had saved his daughter's life, and presented him a folded bill—which, we understand, proved to be ten dollars! The young lady will hardly feel flattered to learn at what price her life was valued by her father. We really hope, for his own credit, as well as to evince his appreciation of a noble act which few persons would at any time have the courage to perform, that he will yet take Mr. Moody's case into consideration—his destitution, the situation of his family, his bodily bruises and sufferings, his narrow escape from instant death, while saving the life of Colonel P.'s daughter, and probably the lives and limbs of others, his confinement to his bed, and the expense of his illness—and make such a donation as so remarkable a case demands. Surely, he cannot have been aware of Mr. Moody's real situation.

There will doubtless be some generous-minded persons, who, on reading this account, and learning the true situation of Mr. Moody, will feel a desire to convey to him some token of their sympathy, and appreciation of his benevolent intrepidity. Anything left for him at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 21 Cornhill, or addressed to him at that place, will be immediately put into his hands. Of course he has no knowledge of any such intimation on our part; but a case like this presents itself not in the light of a favour or gratuity on the part of the contributors, but as a debt of generous self-sacrifice which ought at once to be cancelled, with interest.

CONGRESS.

The size of our paper would have to be quadrupled if, in addition to the usual Anti-Slavery matter, we were to give even extracts from the many capital Anti Slavery speeches which have been made in Congress, within the last few weeks. If this were possible, we should be happy to lay them before our readers; as it is not, we content ourselves with a portion occasionally of a single one. That which follows, is a part of the speech of Mr. Wood, of New-York, and we copy it not only because of its intrinsic excellence and interest, but because we are glad, when an opportunity offers, of showing that a Democrat can now and then be found who is true to his name. We copy from the Union:

* * * * * *

I shall not vote for the bill, Sir, unless this Wilmot proviso obtains. On this question I will endeavour to give my views succinctly, plainly, and moderately. Were I otherwise disposed, I could not, since all the appellatives and expletives in the English language, with its whole diatribe of abuse, such as "dictation," "arrogance," "subterfuge," "sophistry," "insidious assaults," "moral treason," "incendiary," "jesuitical," "outrage," "madness," "insane ravings," "coward's plea," "cateran," "scurvy politicians," have been used up by our Southern friends in their *calm* and *dignified* discussion of the question. In the shape of argument against that proviso, I have heard but little that could be dignified with the name. Has that question been directly met? By no means. One objector says it will embarrass the administration, though for his life he cannot tell how. Another, that it is a political movement. A third, that it is premature. A fourth, that it is an abolition movement. True, it is, there are others who, jumping to the other extreme, deny our right to interfere with the question at all, and who undertake to vindicate the institution of Slavery by invoking the laws of God and man in their defence, and who would throw over them the mantle of Christianity and the shield of the Constitution. To all these, if time suffices, do I intend briefly to reply.

* * * * * *

During the attacks made upon my colleague, [Mr. King,] the desponding inquiry was made by some Southern gentleman, on the other side of the House, whether there was not at least one "Northern man with Southern principles?" The gratulations which have been showered down on some who have preceded me in this debate, show that they have found more than one such. This debate opened with an imposing anti-climax of three of them at once—the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. C. J. Ingersoll,] my colleague, [Mr. Strong,] and the member from Michigan, [Mr. Chipman.] Of the last two I can only say *par-nobile fratrum!* Sir, when I heard the gentleman from New-York mis-representing her citizens, and at the same time I knew he had in his possession, the resolutions of her Legislature, instructing her Senators and requesting her Representatives to use their best efforts to exclude Slavery forever from any territory hereafter to be acquired; and that he must have known there was but one opinion throughout the whole State, and that the very reverse of what he stated, I could scarce restrain from giving utterance to my indignation on the spot. Of all the whole delegation, he alone is recreant. Of all the brave and bright names, who achieved our country's

DEFECTIVE ORIGINAL COPY

independence, here, there was one—and, thank God, but one—Benedict Arnold!

* * * * * *

"I will tell you why my colleague's movement was so obnoxious; it brought out the fact that this war was waged by the South, for the purpose of acquiring slave territory; and, for once, chivalry acted very much like detected chivalry! And, if it cannot be prosecuted for such a purpose, they will be found opposing the administration. It is they, not we, who need those twaddling lectures so frequently delivered from a certain quarter, and which, in point of force, are at least equal to the homilies of Gil Blas's paralyzed bishop. Premature, Sir! If that word has any meaning, it means that time had not been given to cajole the credulous, to frighten the timid, and to buy the venal. It brought out another fact—the intention to again apply, if nothing better could be done, the Missouri compromise. You adopted this compromise in the resolution annexing Texas; and, notwithstanding its provisions, she came here with a Constitution extending Slavery, not to thirty-six degress thirty minutes, but to forty-two degrees North, and I voted against it. Who is there that knows not that that compromise had reference to an entirely different subject from the one now under discussion? Who is there so ignorant as not to know the political death to which every Northern Representative was condemned who voted for that compromise! The North will not go for it now; they will go against it to a man; all save those who, the subjects of a modified rotten borough system, will sell themselves for a foreign mission here, a collectorship there, a warrant in the navy, a commission in the army, or even for some little, beggarly post-office—men who, without any independence or elevation of character, think themselves elevated by holding some pitiful office.

If there be any such from my own State, who, for such purposes, and by such influences, will betray the North, and encircle himself in the arms of the South, let me say to him that an infamy awaits him deeper and blacker than the pit of perdition. While I can respect a Southern man for acting consistently, wrong as I may think him, yet for a Northern man to be found riveting the chains of the slave, and extending slavery, merits a rebuke I have not language to administer, and deserves a position more degraded than the miserable being whose shackles he would fasten. There is no high-minded Southern man but what will look upon him with contempt. He may use him, but he will despise him.

Another charge I wish to repel is, that this is an abolition movement. However intelligent the South may be in matters relating to themselves, this very charge shows how little they know about the North. Like Wilkes, it may be a part of their tactics to make knowingly a false imputation for the sake of inducing a reply, and thus place their opponents in a false position. I shall not thus, be drawn away from the subject. Whatever may have been the cause of that movement, the South is answerable for its present existence. It is owing to your 21st rule—to your destruction of a printing press in one place, and to your murder of an editor in another. It is believed that these and other violences are the legitimate fruits of your slave institutions. Why, Sir, the violent speeches which have been made by some of you on the floor of this House, will make more Abolitionists than the whole North could unmake.

You complain of our "tolerating certain societies." Now, it so happens that the Constitution guaranties the liberty of speech and of the press, and we stand by the Constitution. We are a law-abiding people; we reverence the jury-box, and the trial by jury. Lynch law is no part of our law. We shall never trample on the Constitution, or the laws of the land, to oblige any section of the country. While the Abolitionists are within the law and the Constitution, neither we nor you can molest them. Besides, some of us are converts to the doctrine laid down by a distinguished Virginia statesman, "that truth is great, and will prevail, if left to herself; and that errors cease to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them." We do not suppose, as with you, that convgersions are to be made at the mouth of the cannon, as was recently the case when an attempt was made to turn a Methodist church in Accomac district, in Virginia, from a northern to a southern conference.

Mr. Bayly. May I interrupt my friend from New-York?

Mr. Wood. Certainly. My authority for the statement is contained in the Evening Post, and is copied into that paper from the (Philadelphia) North American. I give the facts as I find them in the public prints, and also a notice of a pamphlet, published by Judge Scarborough and a Mr. Bayley, justifying the outrages.

Mr. Bayly. I will not now reply to the gentleman, but wait until I get the floor.

Mr. Wood. My eloquent friend from Alabama [Mr. Dargan] believes that Slavery was instituted by Divine Providence; as if "what we were evil in was by a Divine thrusting on," "villians by necessity." The plea of him who sought his father's ruin and his brother's life. The gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. Sims,] in a bolder tone, throws over it at once, the mantle of Christianity; though its Divine author declared he came to preach "deliverance to the captive," "and to set at liberty them that are bruised," and has taught us that "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Why, Sir, the very spirit of Christ, all he said, all he did, are against negro slavery, and its inseparable vices and enormities. If Christianity does, indeed, sanction Slavery, why not teach the slave to read his Bible, that he may have the consolations of its precepts to cheer him onward in his degraded and miserable existence? To those who rest on human authority, I commend what Guizot has said, as to the tendencies of Christ's teachings on civil liberty. The honourable member from Pennsylvania [Mr. Ingersoll] has referred us to the treaty of 1783, and the great men who made it. I could give him an example of one, who filled his ship with slaves, and then called all hands to prayer; and yet, subsequently, (if I mistake not,) gave his every effort to the English reformer, in his crusade against Slavery. I might go to Franklin, (president as he was of the first abolition society,) for precepts of philosophy, of political and domestic economy; but for Christianity, I would go to the Word of God itself, and I want them not filtered through the minds of men as fallible as myself. And yet, in connection with this very subject, that Virginia statesman, to whom I have already alluded, has said, "I tremble for my country, when I think of a just God, and that his justice will not sleep forever."

* * * *

But why do you want the north of Mexico? For the same reason you wanted the whole of Texas. Your slave population press upon you, and you are compelled, from the very nature of the institution, to extend yourselves. In other countries—in the free States—a dense population is wealth, power, and strength; and hence desired. With you, it is the reverse. And where is this to stop? For stop it must some day, from the mere want of territory, if from no other cause. Did time permit, I could tell you where it will stop, and what will inevitably be the end of it.

But, says the gentleman from Alabama, (Mr. Bowdon,) "by confining us to certain limits, you mean to compel us to emancipate our slaves." That, gentlemen, is your business, not ours; we have nothing to do with it. But we have a great deal to do with the question, whether this country, if acquired, shall be cursed, as we say: weakened, as Mr. Pinckney said; by the introduction of a slave population.

This is a national question. It is not a question of mere dollars and cents. It is not a mere political question. It is one in which the North has a higher and deeper interest than the South possibly can have. It is a question whether, in the government of the country, she shall be borne down by the influence of your slaveholding aristocratic institutions, that have not in them the first element of democracy. It is a question whether this republic shall be weakened, cramped, and degraded, by an institution doomed of God and man. We know something of the curse of Slavery, and we have seen more; and had we not got rid of it, we should have been in as bad a condition as your more northern slave States now are. Hug this institution to your own bosom, if you choose, till it eats out your very vitals; but let it not blast, and blight, and curse, with the mildew of heaven, any other portion of God's heritage, save where, by leave of the Constitution, it now exists. Say what you will, it hangs over this country a black and portentious cloud. Do gentlemen suppose we are blind, that we cannot look "on this picture, and on that?" I do not wish to make any invidious comparisons, but I am reminded, that in 1790, Virginia contained twice the population of New-York. With fewer square miles of territory, and a less genial climate, in 1840, New-York had twice the number of inhabitants of Virginia; at the former period, the representation of Virginia was the largest in the National Legislature; and now it is the fourth in number. The cause of this cannot be mistaken. Why, Sir, when I hear gentlemen talking of the beauties and blessings of Slavery, and roundly affirm that it is one of the best institutions in the world, I am strongly reminded of the "tale of the tub," and of Peter's insisting that a loaf of bread was a shoulder of mutton; and because Martin and John would not believe it, flying into a furious passion, and turning them both out of doors. Whether we shall be turned out of the Union for believing the evidence of our own eyes, instead of your assertions, remains to be seen. "Do you not see," says one, "that powerful and leading Commonwealth," with her mart of commerce, her railroads and canals, rich in every resource, and abundant in every element of greatness? Do you not see her luxuriant and highly-cultivated fields, laden with the choicest of fruits, and pouring wealth into the lap of their owners? Do you not see those neat cottages, inhabited by happy and contented laborers, devoted to their masters, and clinging to them with child-like confidence and affection? No, I see no such thing; but I see a Commonwealth once powerful, now so no longer,—without commerce, without resources, and all things wearing the aspect of decay. I see fields, once fertile, now almost as barren as if the sirocco of the desert had swept over them. I see miserable hovels, filled with a miserable, degraded, and vicious population, and that very population not unfrequently flying to the cold snows of Canada for protection from the vengeance of a pursuing and threatening master. Sir, this very morning, the inhabitants at the other end of the avenue were early disturbed by the wild shrieks of female distress; a young woman almost as white (as I am informed) as your wives and daughters, with her hands strongly bound, was dragged through the street by a brute, in human shape, claiming to be her owner, and threatening to hush her screams by stamping and crushing her on the pavement, while she (insisting that she was free) wildly appealed to the gathering crowd to protect her. Whether free or a slave, I know not; but he who called himself her master, succeeded (as I am informed) in extorting six hundred dollars from the sympathies of her employer as the price of her freedom.

Mr. McDaniel. I call the gentleman to order.

The Chair. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. Wood. If I am to be called to order for a statement, on the floor of this House, of a fact pertinent to the question before us, and which transpired in open day, on a public street, in this capital, in Heaven's name, what must be the nature of an institution of which its abettors would not permit me to speak, and of which they cannot speak calmly and dispassionately themselves? I know not that I should be surprised at their sensitiveness.—Disregarding, as they do, the voice of the mighty dead, and resisting the tide of civilization, the claims of humanity, and the demands of a pure Christianity, it must be difficult to remain cool and dispassionate. But, Sir, how can we be silent when such scenes are taking place before our eyes, and we and our families are disturbed by the cries and shrieks of the victims of this (as some of you call it) beautiful and Heaven-ordained institution! How can we consent that such an institution, thus impoverishing and brutalizing, shall be extended over free territory?

From the United States Gazette.

SLAVERY.

A public meeting has been held at Richmond, upon the subject of Wilmot's resolutions, that have passed the House of Representatives at Washington. Resolutions were adopted, declaring the spirit of Mr. Wilmot's proviso in opposition to the Constitution of the United States; declaring it to be the duty of the Government to disregard the proviso, and resolving "that, upon this absorbing question, all differences of political opinion should be forgotten, and all Virginians and Southern men should unite, heart and hand, in resisting, even unto death, the doctrines of said proviso."

In addition to the above, which is pretty plain, a Mr. Scott offered a resolution, which left the member unpledged upon the question of war or peace:

This meeting now holds and affirms the constitutional right of all citizens of the United States to take their property, of every description, whether the same be slaves or in any other form, into all the territory which is now within the boundaries of the nation, south of 36 30, north latitude, and into all the territory which may be hereafter acquired south of that line, and that this meeting will hold any attempt by the Congress of the United States to limit this right as in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and absolutely void and of no effect, and that we will, by all peaceable means, and this failing, BY ARMS, if necessary, sustain such of our fellow-citizens as may elect to settle within any such territory hereafter acquired, in the maintenance of their rights thus to settle and take with them their slaves.

The above was unanimously adopted. It, of course, will be read with interest. The determination to take up arms against the Government of the United States, is openly expressed. This is a part of the evils of Annexation; and the nation is likely to be placed before the world in the character of pro-[illegible] a war for territory, and acquiring territory to increase the *area* of Slavery, and, it may be added, of sustaining the principle of Slavery by a *civil* war.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR IRELAND.

The following embrace the contributions for the suffering poor of Ireland and Scotland as far as they have reached us through the various papers of the country. The amount is $204,339.

Many of these amounts are simply the sums casually contributed at the primary meeting of the towns to take the subject into consideration.

NEW-YORK.—New-York City, $53,000; Brooklyn, $5 500; Flushing and Astoria, $720; Poughkeepsie, $650; Albany, $5,000; Delhi, $110; Kingston, $143; Mt. Morris, $611; Rome, $300; Kingsboro', Fulton co. $310; Le Roy, $170; Troy, $1,000; West Troy, $500, Utica, $2 250; Salina and Syracuse, $1,500; Rochester, $1,800; Binghamton, $750; Cortland, $500; Batavia, $200; Oswego, 1,600; Waterloo, $150, Plattsburgh, $400; Buffalo, $1,250.—Total State of New-York, $78, 414.

PENNSYLVANIA.—Philadelphia, $21.000; Pennsylvania Legislature, $625; Chester, $500; Westchester, $700; Litiz, $172; York, $400; Pittsburgh, $2.500; Harrisburgh, $1,000; Pottsville, $2, 686.—Total Pennsylvania, $29,583.

NEW JERSEY.—Newark, $2,000; Jersey City, $1,000; Princeton, $163; Morristown, $115; New Brunswick, $700; Other towns, $1,250.—Total New Jersey $5, 228.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Boston, $15,000; Farmer of Blackstone, $1,000; Nantucket, $2,200; Lowell, $1,400; Worcester, $2,500; Cambridge, $1,500; New Bedford, $4,000; Lawrence, $1,076; Waltham, $440; Lenox, $148; Leicester, $726; Hatfield, (Corn.) $300; Ballardville, $300; Andover, $500; $500; Concord, $362; North Easton, $125.—Total Massachusetts, $31,577.

RHODE ISLAND.—Providence, $6,500; Woonsocket, $750; Hopkinton Society of Friends, $300.—Total Rhode Island $7,550.

MARYLAND.—Baltimore, $7.500.

VIRGINIA.—Richmond, $750; Alexandria, $1,000; Winchester, (in corn and flour) $3,300; Lynchburgh, $217.—Total Virginia, $5,267

OHIO.—Springfield, $200; Cleveland, $2,500; Columbus, $1,800; Cincinnati, $7,500.—Total Ohio, $12,000.

NORTH CAROLINA.—Raleigh, $1,000; Morgantown, $350.—Total North Carolina, $1,350.

GEORGIA.—Savannah, $2,400.

ALABAMA.—Mobile, $750.

MISSOURI.—St. Louis, Missouri, $1,750.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Washington, $5,000.

LOUISIANA.—New Orleans, $13,000.

MAINE.—Hallowell, $420.

CONNECTICUT.—Hartford, $1,000; Farmington, $50. Total Connecticut, $1,050.

AT SEA.—Passengers per Cambria, $500.

The above list is made out by the Tribune. Since it was published, the amount contributed in this city has reached the sum of $70,000. The committee have already chartered two vessels, the barque Victor, and brig Duncan, to be loaded with provisions for Ireland. The contributions from the Catholic churches alone of this city, Brooklyn, and vicinity, amount to nearly $14 000. Among other generous donations, we observe that Francis Jackson acknowledges the receipt of $200 from the Hutchinsons.

The members of the *Northampton Association of Education and Industry* have also contributed over $70.

BIBLES FOR THE SLAVES.

We find in the (Hallowell, Maine,) Liberty Standard the following letter from the Rev. E. N. Kirk. We wonder that he should advocate the sending of "incendiary documents" to the slaves, for he could certainly find as good arguments for not doing so, as for giving church-fellowship to their masters.

Messrs. Gilbert, Lovejoy, and others:

GENTLEMEN:—I am much gratified to find you engaged in behalf of the oppressed, in a way which appears to me unexceptionable and greatly desirable. I cannot doubt that the American Bible Society will immediately have access to a very large number of the African population in the South and Southwestern States. And I am willing to put one Bible into every dwelling of that unhappy people, even where there are none able to read. The mere possibility that it may induce one to acquire the ability to read; or the possibility that some visitor may read to them from their own Bible, fully justifies the expense; nay, without any superstitious regard, to the volume, I regard the mere presence of it desirable. Every human being ought to have free access to the Word of God in his vernacular tongue.

I moreover approve of your movement because no righteous objection nor obstruction can be found to it. No man or body of men has a right to prevent any human being from learning to read, and from reading the Word of God, to do all that is in his power to communicate that word to every other human being.

The fact that there are laws enacted against it, whether in Ancient Rome or in Modern Rome, or Mecca or in Charleston, in no way affects our duty; and he that hinders us in this good work, must answer to Christ for it. I am therefore most cordial in lending my aid to encourage the American Bible Society in the work of distribution among the slaves of free America."

Enclosed is a slight testimonial of my sympathy, to aid in defraying the expenses of the committee.

Yours, respectfully,
EDWARD N. KIRK.

BOSTON, February, 20, 1847.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1847.

Lysander Spooner on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery.

"DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURE IN THE ARISTOCRATIC COUNTENANCE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION."—Gouverneur Morris, in the Convention of 1787. Madison Papers, 1364.

We have read with attention the many columns which Mr. Goodell has showered upon us from various quarters, and can say, with perfect sincerity, without meaning to be satirical,—that they contain nothing which needs any notice from us, or which can mislead a thoughtful reader of our previous criticism.

Next in order of time comes the Essay of Lysander Spooner on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery. We shall but fulfil an old promise in reviewing the argument it contains. Events beyond our control have delayed us till now, which we regret only as it seems to have led some of Mr. Spooner's admirers to imagine that the delay proceeded from an unwillingness, on our part, to measure lances with so skilful an adversary. We exhort them, on the contrary, to believe that we have no innate antipathy to the idea of an Anti-Slavery Constitution;—that so far from being obstinately wedded to our own opinion, Mr. Spooner, or any one else, shall find in us a most ready, willing, and easy convert to a doctrine, which will restore to us the power of voting,—a right we much covet,—and a direct share in the Government of the country, a privilege we appreciate as highly as any one can. Only *convince* us fairly and we will outdo Alvan Stewart himself in glowing eulogy of this new-found virtue of the American Constitution. Indeed if merely *believing* the Constitution to be Anti-Slavery would really make it so, we would be the last to stir the question. If the beautiful theories of some of our friends could oust from its place the ugly reality of a pro-slavery administration, we would sit quiet, and let Spooner and Goodell convert the nation at their leisure. But alas, the ostrich does not get rid of his enemy by hiding her head in the sand. Slavery is not abolished, although we have persuaded ourselves that it does not exist. The pro-slavery clauses of the National Compact still stand there in full operation, notwithstanding our logic. The Constitution will never be amended by persuading men that it does not need amendment. National evils are only cured by holding men's eyes open, and forcing them to gaze on the hideous reality. To be able to meet a crisis men must understand and appreciate it.

All that we have to do, *as Abolitionists*, with Mr. Spooner's argument is to consider its influence on the Anti-Slavery cause. He maintains that *the Judges of the United States Courts have the right to declare Slavery illegal*, and he proposes that they should be made to do so. We believe that in part he mistakes fancies for argument; in part he bases his conclusions on a forced interpretation of legal maxims, and that the rest of his reasoning, where not logically absurd and self-contradictory, is subversive of all sound principles of Government and of public faith. Any movement or party, for there, founded on his plan, would, so soon as it grew considerable enough to attract public attention, be met by the contempt and disapprobation of every enlightened and honest man.—To trust our cause with such a leader is to insure its shipwreck. To keep, therefore, so far as our influence extends, the Anti-Slavery movement in its legitimate channel, to base it on such principles as shall deserve and command the assent of every candid mind, to hold up constantly before the nation the mirror of its own deformity, we undertake the distasteful task of proving the Constitution hostile to us and the slave.

It is but justice to Mr. Spooner to acknowledge that his performance differs from most of those which have preceded it, not only in the ingenuity of the argument, but in the honest aim of the writer. Even his "the wish" does not appear to have been a father to the thought." He did not first found a theory and then stretch out both hands to clutch something that would sustain him in the right of voting at all. He did not violate his own convictions, and then, obstinately shutting his eyes cry out, "I do n't *see* where I am inconsistent." His logic does not grow out of a sneering love of the ballot, or a secret desire to put "non-resistance *hors du combat*." He did not vote, in order to save a corrupt and trembling Church and shield it from the storm of deserved rebuke, endeavour to build an ark of political refuge out of legal scraps and disjointed and misunderstood quotations. He seems to have persuaded himself of the truth of his own theory, and then to have thrown it fearlessly out to the world, trusting in its truth to make it useful, and with no ulterior object or private end to serve.

Before we touch on the argument of Mr. Spooner's Essay, we wish to call attention to two points:

1st. Allowing, for the moment, as he claims, that the Constitution contains no guarantee or recognition of Slavery—and granting him, also, in his own words:

"That the instrument was plain, and the people had common-sense; and those two facts cannot stand together consistently with the idea that there was any general or even considerable misunderstanding of its meaning."—(p. 126 2d Edition.)

We go on to ask, (of Abolitionists, not of Mr. Spooner,) how comes it that, as he all along confesses, Courts, Congress, and the people have uniformly warped and twisted the whole instrument aside and awry to serve and sustain Slavery? that the whole *Administration* of the Government, from its very commencement, has been pro-slavery? If the Constitution be guiltless of any blame in this matter, then surely there must be some powerful element at work in the Union itself, which renders it impossible for this to be an Anti-slavery *nation*, even when blessed with an *Anti-Slavery* Constitution; and the experience of fifty years proves Union itself under *any form*, to be impossible without guilt. In such circumstances, no matter what the Constitution is, whether good or bad, it is the duty of every honest man to join in the war-cry of the American Anti-Slavery Society! "*no Union with Slaveholders.*" For if we could not escape the infamy and the sin of such a pro-slavery *administration* as ours has always been under a Constitution pure as Mr. Spooner describes it to be, then, as we never can have a better, we ought to give up the experiment.

2d. As far as we can understand him, Mr. Spooner does not deny the universal Northern doctrine, that the Executive officers of the Government are bound, while they retain their situations, to obey and execute the laws in that manner and sense which the Supreme Court decide and enjoin. [His views of the duty of the Supreme Court itself we have stated, and shall soon discuss. But from the importance which he ascribes to them we have a right to infer his concurrence in the opinion that the decisions of that Court are binding on the other departments of Government. For if they are not so, of what consequence is it what those decisions are?] Of course no one has ever denied that the Supreme Court now construes the Constitution in a pro-slavery sense. This, then, is the rule of [illegible] until altered. Here again the position of the [illegible] Anti-Slavery Society is untouched. For whatever the real character of the Constitution, if those who *now swear* to support that instrument are bound to support it in the sense which the Courts give it, then, surely, no Abolitionist can consistently take such an oath or ask another person to do so.

With neither of these points has Mr. Spooner himself anything to do. He, we believe, does not profess to be an Abolitionist; at least, in this essay he considers the question simply as a lawyer, without entering into its further bearings. We suggest them for the benefit of those Abolitionists who try to hide themselves behind him, and make a use of his argument which he never intended, and probably would not sanction.

Mr. Spooner's first chapter is employed in answering the question, "what is law?"

"That law, I mean, which, and which only, judicial tribunals are morally bound, under all circumstances, to declare and sustain?

"In answering this question, I shall attempt to show that law is an intelligible principle of right, necessarily resulting from the nature of man; and not an arbitrary rule, that can be established by mere will, numbers, or power."—(p. 5, 2d edit.)

His conclusion is, "that law is simply the rule, principle, obligation, or requirement of natural justice." (p. 6.)

And finally he maintains:

"If, then, law really be nothing other than the rule, principle, obligation, or requirement of natural justice, it follows that government can have no powers except such as individuals may *rightfully* delegate to it; that no law, inconsistent with men's natural rights, can arise out of any contract or compact of government: *that constitutional law, under any form of government, consists only of those principles of the written constitution, that are consistent with natural law, and man's natural rights;* and that any other principles, that may be expressed by the letter of any constitution, are void and not law, and all judicial tribunals are bound to declare them so.—(p. 14, 2d edit.)

We might pass this chapter by without notice as not concerning our inquiry, since Mr. Spooner not only conducts his argument afterward without reference to it, but distinctly allows that a definition exactly the opposite of his is the one usually adopted by the people, by Courts of Justice, and by Governments. So that,

"The very name of law has come to signify little more than an arbitrary command of power without reference to its justice or its injustice; its innocence or its criminality."—(p. 9.)

Our only object is to abolish Slavery, and not to correct the fundamental ideas which men hold as to law or Government; and hence, all we have to do with law is to find out what it *practically* is, and then amend it if we can. We might, therefore, we repeat, pass this chapter by, taking *law* to mean what Mr. Spooner allows that our Judicial tribunals, our Government, and the general sense of the people have defined it to be, in the words he quotes from Noah Webster, "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the Supreme power of a State, commanding what its subjects are to do and prohibiting what they are to forbear."

Or as Heineccius describes it:

"Civil laws are the commands of the Supreme power in a State."

Or as Chancellor Kent defines it:

"Municipal law is a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the Supreme power in a State."

Or with Nathan Dane, the author of the Ordinance of 1787:

"Municipal or civil law is the rule of municipal or civil conduct prescribed by the superior power in the State commanding what the Legislature deems right, and prohibiting what it deems wrong."

Or with C. Justice Wilmot:

"Statute law is the *will of the Legislature* in writing—common law is nothing but statutes worn out by time."

Or with the Roman law, from which Mr. Spooner takes some of his definitions:

"What the people command, let that be law." XII tables of Rome.

"The will of the Prince, that is law." Justinian's Inst.

"The rule which each State chooses for itself, that is the law of such State." Ibid.

We might extend these, but they are only the varied expression of what Mr. Spooner *allows* is the generally accepted definition; further quotation is useless.

We shall, however, dwell awhile on this chapter. Mr. Spooner himself draws the line very clearly and fairly between his own speculations and what he allows to be the generally received definition, and never confuses the two. But that portion of the Abolitionists who are misled by his book, often find their greatest difficulty in the points discussed in this chapter. We shall endeavour therefore to unravel it a little, since the views it contains are not new, but have been floating a long time in the Anti-Slavery horizon—and only spared because no one has cared to notice them.

Mr. Spooner's doctrine is, that, "only what is just and right, is law." This proposition is both true and false, simply because the word *law* has many meanings, like its Latin synonym *jus*, which Dr. Taylor says (Elem. Civil Law,) has forty significations. The most usual source of mistake in argument is the use of ambiguous terms. Now, Mr. Spooner's proposition is true of the law of Nature, which Cicero calls "*right reason, the same thing at Athens as at Rome;*" but it is false when applied to municipal, national, civil law, which is often a very different thing at Louisville from what it is at London. It is with this civil law only that we have to do in an argument like the present. Mr. Spooner's quotations at the close of this chapter, relate mostly to the law of Nature, to law in its most comprehensive sense, or the science of Justice; such as Hooker's sublime poetry, assuring us of law "that her seat is the bosom of God, and her voice the harmony of the world."

This discussion, however, is a matter of no consequence to the argument. Leaving it, therefore, let us consider Mr. Spooner's main proposition. "Only that which is just, is law, and all judicial tribunals are bound so to declare:" taking law to mean the rule of civil affairs in a nation, the only sense of the term with which this argument has anything to do.

In the first place a proposition may justly be suspected not to be sound, when the author confesses in regard to it, as Mr. Spooner does here, that,

"It may make sad havoc with constitutions and statute books," and "it is *possible, perhaps*, that this doctrine would spare enough of our existing Constitution to save our Government from the necessity of a new organization!!!"

Surely mankind cannot be presumed to have so universally mistaken what they were about, as to have *uniformly* set up Governments, that were not *legal* in their own sense of the term? And as surely words must be interpreted according to the sense mankind choose to put upon them, and not according to the caprice of an individual. Mr. Spooner is at liberty to say that much of what the world *calls* law, is not obligatory because it is not just in the eye of God; and there all good men will agree with him. But to assert that because a thing is not right it is not *law*, as that term is commonly and rightfully used, is entering into the question of what constitutes the basis of government among men: and according to a man's theory of Government, will be his denial or assent to the proposition. Does Mr. Spooner mean to say merely, that a nation in making its laws has no right, in the eye of God, to perpetrate injustice? We agree with him. It is a doctrine certainly as old as Cicero, and may be traced through Grotius and Locke, and all writers on the subject, down to Jefferson and Channing. Nations are bound by the same rule of right and wrong, as individuals: agreed. Or does he mean to say that in settling what shall be *the rule* of civil conduct the voice of the majority is not final and conclusive, or its own officers in *all the departments of Government?* Then we differ from him, entirely, and assert that on his plan, Government is impossible. An individual may, and ought to resign his office, rather than assist in a law he deems unjust. But while he retains, under the majority, one of *their* offices, he retains it on *their* conditions, whatever, to obey and enforce *their* decrees. There can be no more self-evident proposition than that to every Government, the majority must rule, and their will be *uniformly* obeyed. Now, if the majority enact a wicked law, and the Judge refuses to endorse it, which is to yield, the Judge or the majority? Of course the first.

According to Mr. Spooner, no provision would be law until it had secured the assent, not only of the Legislature,—the power appointed to *make* laws—but of the Judiciary also,—the power appointed only to *construe* and *apply* them. Apply this principle to our Union and it brings upon the present Constitution a similar disease to that which killed the old Confederation, under which laws were of no practical value unless the several states *chose* to execute them. According to Mr. Spooner, however, it is an evil inseparable from all forms of Government, since every decision of the National Legislature must be *perpetually* subject to the discretionary power of every Court in the twenty-eight States!

"Only that which is just is law, and all judicial tribunals are bound so to declare." This is Mr. Spooner's proposition. Grant, for the purpose of this argument, that only what is just is law. We allow that no laws in support of Slavery are morally binding. Possibly Mr. Spooner means the same thing, only expresses it more strongly. The only important point at issue is—*when Governments enact such laws, what is the proper remedy?*

This question has been answered in three ways.

1st. Old-fashioned patriotism replies, with Algernon Sydney: "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God" Mr. Spooner states that "the only duties any one owes a wicked Constitution, are disobedience, resistance, destruction."

2d. Next comes the Christian rule, that too sanctioned by Locke, and by Plato—the course of the Quakers—the motto of the American Anti-Slavery Society—"SUBMIT to every ordinance of man"—but suffer any penalty rather than JOIN in doing a wrong act; meanwhile, let your loud protest prepare a speedy and quiet revolution.

3d. Thirdly comes Mr. Spooner's plan:

"If the majority, however large, of the people of a country, enter into a contract of government, called a constitution, by which they agree to aid, abet, or accomplish any kind of injustice, this contract of government is unlawful and void—and for the same reason that a contract of the same nature between two individuals, is unlawful and void. Such a contract of government confers no rightful authority upon those appointed to administer it."

* * * * * * *

"Judicial tribunals, sitting under the authority of this unlawful contract or constitution, are bound, equally with other men, to declare it, and all unjust enactments passed by the Government in pursuance of it, unlawful and void. These judicial tribunals cannot, by accepting office under a Government, rid themselves of that paramount obligation, that all men are under, to declare, if they declare anything, that justice is law; that Government can have no lawful powers, except those with which it has been invested by lawful contract; and that an unlawful contract for the establishment of Government, is as unlawful and void as any other contract to do injustice."

* * * * * * *

"No oaths, which judicial or other officers may take, to carry out and support an unlawful contract or Constitution of Government, are of any moral obligation."—(p. 9.)

And here begins the real and only important dispute between us. The reader may forget, if he pleases, all we have said. Mr. Spooner's differences and our own, up to this point, are mere questions of theory. It matters little which side be adopted. His position now is:

That laws and constitutions which violate justice, are void. They are as little binding in the eye of the law, as in the eye of God. They are *legally* as well as morally void:—

So far we agree with him, or differ so slightly, that here we care not to dispute the matter. He goes on:

A Judge *holding office under such Constitutions* is authorized and bound to treat them as *void*, and to decide cases, not according to them, but as his sense "of natural justice" dictates.

Here we differ from him, maintaining that the position of the officers of such a Government differs from that of the private individual; their duty is to resign their posts whenever unwilling to fulfil the conditions on which they receive them, and treat as MEN, treat the laws as void.

This question is not to be confounded with one somewhat similar to it, and which has been sometimes discussed, especially in England, whether a Judge there may disregard an unjust statute? Our present question is different, for it should be remembered that in England, there is no written Constitution. Even if a Judge had such powers there, WHICH HE HAS NOT, it would, by no means follow, that he had the same under our form of Government. There the Judge swears, simply to bear true allegiance to the King. It might, therefore, with some plausibility, be argued, that having no test to which to bring acts of Parliament, except the rules of natural justice, Judges were authorized to declare them void when inconsistent with those rules. Such a doctrine, however, is repudiated by the almost unanimous voice of the English law.

However the case may be in England, here the case is different. Our Government is founded on contract. So agrees Mr. Spooner:

"The Constitution is a contract; a written contract, consisting of a certain number of precise words, to which, and to which only, all the parties to it have, in theory, agreed. Manifestly neither this contract, nor the meaning of its words, can be changed, without the consent of all the parties to it."—(p. 123.)

"A contract for the establishment of Government, being nothing but a voluntary contract between individuals for their mutual benefit, differs in nothing that is essential to its validity from any other contract between man and man, or between nation and nation."—[p. 8.)

"Our constitutions are but contracts."—Note p. 8.

Under our Constitution, then, the people and the officeholder make a contract together. They grant him certain specified powers, and demand of him certain specified duties. He deliberately looks over the catalogue (that is, the Constitution),—assents to it,—swears that he agrees to it, and will perform his part,—and so takes office and acquires power. That power, Mr. Spooner thinks, he may retain while he refuses to perform the conditions on which he received it; and *that* power, granted him expressly, and only for the support of the Constitution, he *is bound* to use for the destruction of that instrument. Mr. Spooner's ground is that, "immoral contracts are void." Granted; but if they are absolute nullities, then the Governments supposed to spring from them, do not exist, since they have nothing to spring from. Accordingly, the supposed Judge is up a tree, and has no authority to *declare or decide anything*. As Mr Spooner says (p. 9.) "Such a contract of Government confers *no rightful authority* upon those appointed to administer it." Of course he would not have a Judge use a *wrongful* authority, for any purpose.

Again, "immoral contracts are not binding." True. But if I receive a sum of money, on my promise to commit murder, and afterward, my moral sense awakens, and I refuse to do the deed, does that authorize me to retain the money? Such a moral sense would be a most accommodating one! and such godliness might well be "accounted gain"!

The rule plainly is that, if power is put into our hands on certain conditions, and we become, *from any cause*, unable or unwilling to fulfil those conditions, we ought to surrender back the power to those who granted it. If, therefore, the Constitution is pro-slavery, (as Mr. Spooner and ourselves are now supposing it to be,) the Judges have agreed to do certain pro-slavery acts, and they must perform their whole contract, or yield up the power they received on that condition. Judges are the people's servants, employed to do certain acts. If they cannot *do those acts*, let them "be no longer stewards."

This argument seems to us conclusive as it stands. But Mr. Spooner's principles give it additional force. He says (p. 99, 2d edition,) that

"Here office is not given to any one because he has a right to it, nor because it may be even a benefit to him. It is conferred upon him, or rather confided to him, as a trust, and solely as a trust, for the sole benefit of the people of the United States. The President, as President, is not supposed to have any rights in the office on his own account; or any rights except what the people, for their own benefit, and not for his, have voluntarily chosen to grant to him."

If this be so—if the President, or Judge, has no right but what the people have granted him, will Mr. Spooner affirm that the people ever granted to any Judge the right to disregard the pro-slavery clauses of *their* Constitution? If office be a "trust, and solely a trust," is the trust-holder to execute his duty according to his own views or according to the trust deed?

Again, Mr. Goodell had maintained that Governments have certain inherent powers, as that, for instance, of abolishing Slavery, and executing justice, &c.;—that these enter into the very idea of a Government, and every Government possesses them, whether specifically granted to it or not; but Mr. Spooner (p. 8,) scouts as "an imposture, the idea of any necessary or inherent authority or sovereignty in our Government, as such," and maintains that they are nothing but "contracts." If, then, they are only contracts, will he explain where Judges get a power which the other party to the contract never meant to give them?

When, therefore, Mr. Spooner or any one else has shown us an English Judge, for instance, putting aside an act of Parliament because of its injustice, he has not then reached our case. Let him show an English Judge holding himself authorized to disregard the terms of the union between Scotland and England, and between Ireland and England, and he will have advanced somewhere within sight of the position of an American Magistrate under our Constitution. Even those, however, are not equally strong cases, for such a Judge has never *expressly sworn* to maintain those compacts.

The royal oath to maintain "the church established" comes nearest to our case, and it is well known with what scrupulous anxiety even the profligate Geo. IV. clung to what he fancied his duty under that.

"These Judicial tribunals, says Mr. Spooner, cannot, by accepting office under a Government, rid themselves of the paramount obligation that all men are under to declare, if they *declare anything*, that justice is law."

"If *they declare anything*;" that is a very significant "IF." Was there a lurking doubt in the writer's mind whether our view was not the correct one? whether Judges had a right to "declare anything" in such circumstances? If there was let him cherish it. True, such Judges cannot rid themselves, *as men*, "of the paramount obligation to declare, if they declare anything, that justice is law." But it is as men, as simple individuals, units in the sight of God, that this "paramount obligation" rests upon them. God knows them not as Judges. Their only "paramount obligation" as Judges, is to do what they agreed to do when they were made Judges, or quit the bench. God does not require of any of his creatures to juggle their fellows out of the gift of power, and then use that power contrary to their promises, in order to serve humanity. That were to ask "robbery for burnt offering."

But putting out of view this point of *contract*, between the people and their servants, we maintain that such a line of judicial duty is inconsistent with the existence of uniform and regular Government. It is the first step toward anarchy.

"Only what is just and right is law." Granted, but who is to decide what is just and right? We say that *for the purpose of the civil government of any nation*, the majority of that nation is to decide, and their decision is final, and constitutes for that nation LAW. Mr. Spooner thinks not; he thinks that each Judge is to decide for himself and act accordingly. We say that a uniform Government is impossible on this plan. "Statutes, says Webster, are but recommendations, if each man is to construe them as he pleases." *Quot homines, tot sententiæ*, (many men many minds.) Law would be one thing in Maine and another thing in Maryland—one thing to-day, another thing to-morrow. And each day and each Court would think itself infallibly right. "Orthodoxy is *my* doxy," said the English Bishop. "By *right reason*, says Atterbury, every one would be willing to mean *his own*." "Discourses about Natural Law," says another eminent writer, "are the fullest of mistakes and most

This doctrine is usually sustained by disconnected quotations from Blackstone, among which the following generally occupies the first place:

"This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid, derive all their force, and all their authority mediately or immediately, from this original."—*Blackstone, Vol. 1, p. 41.*

It will be observed that Blackstone only asserts that *bad laws are void*, without touching the question of the remedy in such case, or whether Judges may declare and treat them so. His able commentator, Prof. Christian, in a note on this passage, discusses this point, and decisively rejects the doctrine. He says:

"If an act of Parliament should, like the ediet of Herod, command all children under a certain age to be slain, the Judge ought to resign his office rather than be auxiliary to its execution; *but it could only be declared void by the same legislative power by which it was ordained.*"

With this, the other commentators, Chitty and the rest, agree. Sedgwick unites with them in the same opinion. Woodeson, Blackstone's second successor in his professional chair, adds his assent in these words:

"We cannot expect that all acts of legislators will be ethically perfect; but if their proceedings are to be decided upon by their subjects, Government and subordination cease."—Chitty's Blackstone note, p. 41.—Wood El. Jur. 48.

Blackstone himself, in a subsequent page of his work, distinctly denies the doctrine which some might infer from the general terms he had used above. On the 91st page of his first volume, he says,—

"I know it is generally laid down more largely, that acts of Parliament, contrary to reason, are void. But if the Parliament will positively enact a thing to be done which is unreasonable, I know of no power, in the ordinary forms of the Constitution, that is vested with authority to control it; and the examples usually alledged in support of this sense of the rule, do none of them prove, that, where the *main object* of a statute is unreasonable, the Judges are at liberty to reject it; for that were to set the judicial power above that of the Legislature, which would be subversive of all Government. * * * * * * If we could conceive it possible for the Parliament to enact that a man should try as well his own causes as those of other persons, there is no court that has power to defeat the intent of the Legislature, when couched in such evident and express words, as leave, no doubt, whether it was the intent of the Legislature or not."

Chancellor Kent, also, of New-York, the highest living authority, though citing and praising the few old cases which sustain a different doctrine, concludes with Blackstone, thus:—

"It is a principle in the English law, that an act of Parliament, delivered in clear and intelligible terms, cannot be questioned, or its authority controlled in any court of Justice. When it is said in the books that a statute contrary to natural equity and reason, or repugnant or impossible to be performed, is void, the cases are understood to mean that the courts are to give the statute a reasonable construction. They will not readily presume, out of respect and duty to the lawgiver, that any very unjust or absurd consequence was within the contemplation of the law. *But if it should happen to be too palpable in its direction to admit of but one construction, there is no doubt in the English law, as to the binding efficacy of the statute.* The will of the Legislature is the supreme law of the land, and demands perfect obedience."—Kent's Comm. 1. 447.

Locke lays down the same principle substantially when he says: "In all cases while the Government subsists, the *Legislature* must be supreme. When that transgresses its bounds, the right of revolution begins." And Paley also:

"There necessarily exists in every Government a power, from which *the Constitution has provided no appeal*, absolute, omnipotent, *uncontrollable*, arbitrary, despotic. This person or assembly is the supreme power of the State * * * the Legislature of the State.—Mor. & Pol. Phil. ch. 6.

Says the United States Circuit Court:

"We cannot declare a legislative act void because it conflicts with our opinions of policy, expediency, or justice. * * *

The remedy for unwise or oppressive legislation, within constitutional bounds, is by an appeal to the justice and patriotism of the representatives of the people. *If this fails*, the people in their sovereign capacity can correct the evil; but courts cannot assume their rights. * * *

That would submit laws to a test as fallible and uncertain as all rules must be, which have not their source in some certain and definite standard, which varies neither with times, circumstances, or opinions. * * * * *

There is no paramount and supreme law which defines the law of nature, or settles these great principles of legislation, which are said by lawyers to control State Legislatures, in the exercise of the powers conferred on them by the people in the Constitution.

If it is once admitted that there exists in this Court a power to declare a State law void, which conflicts with no constitutional provision, if we assume the right to annul them for their supposed injustice, or oppressive operation, we become the makers and not the expounders of constitutions. Our opinions will not be a judgment on what was the pre-existing law of the case, but on what it is after we shall have so amended and modified it as to meet our ideas of justice, policy, and wise legislation, by a direct usurpation of legislative powers, and a flagrant violation of the duty enjoined on us by the Judiciary act.—1 Baldwin C. C. R. 74.

Mr. Justice Iredell, of the Supreme Court of the United States says:

"Some speculative jurists have held that a legislative act against natural justice must, in itself, be void, but I cannot think that under such a Government, (as that of England,) *any court of Justice would possess a power to declare it so.*"

After quoting Blackstone to sustain that position, he adds:

"If any act of Congress violate constitutional provisions, it is void; * * * If, on the other hand, the Legislature of the Union, of any member of the Union shall pass a law within the general scope of their constitutional power, the courts cannot pronounce it to be void merely because it is, in their judgment, contrary to the principles of natural justice. The ideas of natural justice are regulated by no fixed standard; the ablest and purest men have differed upon the subject.—3 Dallas Rep. 399.

If the Legislature should pass a law in plain, unequivocal, and explicit terms, within the scope of their constitutional powers, I know of no authority in this Government to pronounce such an act void, merely because, in the opinion of the Judicial tribunals, it was contrary to the principles of natural justice. For this would be vesting in the Court latitudinarian powers which might be abused, and would necessarily lead to collision between the Legislative and Judicial departments, dangerous to the well-being of society, or at least, not in harmony with the structure of our ideas of natural government. Justice is regulated by no certain or fixed standard, so that the ablest and purest minds might sometimes differ with respect to it. * * Necessity dispenses with general principles. The Legislature must be the judges when that necessity exists.—2 Rawle (Pennsylvania) Reports, 374.

The Supreme Court of the United States affirm the same doctrine, in a sentence which Mr. Spooner makes the corner-stone of his book:

"Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the law is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness*, to induce a Court of justice to suppose a design to effect such objects."—(United States *vs.* Fisher et al. 2 Cranch, 390.)

"This language of the Supreme Court, (says Mr. Spooner,) admits, 1st. that the preservation of men's *rights* is the vital principle of law, and 2d. that courts (and the Supreme Court of the United States in particular) will trample upon that principle at the bidding of the Legislature, when the mandate comes in the shape of a statute of such '*irresistible clearness*,' that its meaning cannot be evaded."

Lord Mansfield recognizes the same principle in that sentence, which forms the other bulwark of Mr Spooner's argument. In the "Somerset" case, Lord Mansfield said speaking of the acknowledged sin of Slavery:

"So high an act of dominion must be recognized by the law of the country where it is used. * * * The state of slavery is of such a nature, that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political—but only *positive law*, which preserves its force long after the reasons, occasion, and time itself from whence it was created, is erased from the memory. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but *positive law.*"

Positive law, then, can so establish even Slavery, that even courts must treat it as legal.

The same doctrine shines out in all the cases, either on this side the ocean or in England, in which the Slave-Trade has been brought in question. Certainly here would be a case in which, if anywhere, a Judge would use the power, if he had it, to treat bad laws as void. Still, no Judge, whatever his private opinions, has usurped the right to overrule the law of nations, which holds that trade to be lawful. Sir Wm. Scott, one of the highest, if not highest authority among recent English Judges in his department, holds the following language, in a case where the question of that trade was before him, and in which he decided that the Slave-Trade was not a crime by the law of nations:

"I must remember that in discussing this question, I must consider it not according to any *private moral apprehensions* of my own, (if I entertained them ever so sincerely,) but as *the law* considers it. * * An act must be *legally* criminal, because neither this Court or any other can carry its private apprehensions, independent of law, into its public judgments, on the quality of actions. It must conform to the judgment of the law upon that subject, and acting as a Court, in the administration of law, it cannot attribute criminality to an act where the law imputes none. It must look to the legal standard of morality on a question of this nature."—2 Dodson, Adm. Rep. 247.

C. Justice Marshall says, in a similar case:

"That it (the Slave-Trade) is contrary to the law of nature, will scarcely be denied. * * * Whatever might be the answer of a moralist to this question, a jurist must seek its *legal* solution in those principles of action which are sanctioned by the usages, the national acts, and the general assent of the world, of which he considers himself a part. * * * A jurist could not say that a practice thus supported was illegal."—Antelope 10, Wheaton 66.

See also Lord Mansfield 1. T. R. 313; Judge Story 1. Gall. 66: Judges Best and Bayley 3. B. & A. 353: C. I. Herle temp. Edw. 3. Dwarris 643: Lord Hardwick, Dwarris 785: C. J. Shaw in the "Med Case," 18 Pick. Rep. 193.

I know that there are a few early cases, and a few rash assertions of Lord Coke, plausible perhaps in a Government like the English, where, as there exists no written Constitution, it might possibly be argued that the courts had a right to bring all laws to the test of those great principles of common sense and common justice, which form the only thing that can be called a foundation for British law. But *here* we have a specific, definite, limited, *written* Constitution. It contains ALL the principles which the people, the nation, have agreed shall form the foundation of our *national* law. The only test, therefore, to which our courts have any right to submit the action of the Legislature is, to ask, is it constitutional? If so, it is legally binding on them—no matter how unjust or how unreasonable it is. Such is the framework of Government under which we live.

But of even this assertion of Coke, Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, his contemporary, has remarked that it is,

"A paradox which derogateth much from the wisdom and power of Parliament, that when the three estates, King, Lords, and Commons, have spent their labour in making a law, three Judges or a bench, shall destroy and prostrate their pains, advancing the reason of a particular court above the judgment of all the realm. Besides, more temperately did that reverend Chief Justice Herle, temp. Ed. III. deliver his opinion, cited by Coke, 8 R. 118. when he said, some acts of Parliament are made against law and right, which THEY THAT MADE THEM, perceiving, would not put them into execution; for it is *magis congruum* (more proper) that acts of Parliament should be corrected by the same pen that drew them, than be dashed to pieces by opinion of a few Judges."—Quoted by Dwarris, 643.

And further, still, Lord Coke qualifies the general language he had used when he elsewhere holds:

"That Judges are not to be encouraged to direct their conduct by the crooked cord of discretion, but by the golden metwand of the law; that is, not to construe statutes by equity, but to collect the sense of the Legislature by a sound interpretation of its language according to reason and grammatical correctness, and to be controlled by the *common law.*"—Dwarris on Statutes, (p. 645, 703.)

Dwarris, a learned and distinguished writer, in his late able work on "Statutes," sums up the matter thus:

"The general and received doctrine certainly is, that an act of Parliament, of which the terms are explicit and the meaning plain, cannot be questioned, or its authority controlled in any Court of Justice," and "where the meaning is plain to regard consequences in the interpretation would be assuming legislative authority."

For Judges to [illegible] according to their sense of right would suppose the Legislature,

"To have abdicated its functions and delegated its power and duties to the Judges."—pp. 646, 720, 755.

To detain the reader one moment longer with the example of another nation, let us add that the French law, generally considered much more loose on this point of judicial duty, is substantially the same with what we have been quoting. It allows the Bench to consult equity and use its individual discretion only on those points where *the law is silent.*

"Si l'on marque de loi il faut consulter l'usage on l'equité. L'equité est le retour a la loi naturelle, dans le silence, l'opposition ou l'obscurité des lois positives."

Le pouvoir judiciaire etabli pour appliquer les lois, a besoin d'etre dirige dans cette application par certaines regles. Elles sont telles que la raison particuliere d'aucun homme ne puiss jamais prévaloir sur la loi, raison publique."

(Where there is no law, consult custom or equity. Equity is the return to natural law in case of the silence, self-contradiction, or obscurity of statutes. Judges appointed to apply the laws, must be guided by fixed rules. These are such that the conscience of an individual can never be allowed to overrule the law, which is the national conscience.) Quoted by Dwarris, p. 787. 8.

Are we not, then, borne out in our assertion that neither any practical theory of Government nor the recorded opinions of Statists or Jurists countenance the doctrine of this Essay, that Judges are proper persons to remedy, by overruling, the bad laws of a State. On the contrary all combine to point us to the duty of submission, or to the ultimate and extreme right of Revolution, as the appropriate course in the circumstances; and allow the Judge no choice but to apply the laws, as they are handed him by the Supreme Power, or to vacate his seat.

Indeed the most famous definition of Civil Liberty makes it consist in the "being governed only by *known pre constituted, inflexible* rules." What becomes of this if the decisions of the Court are to vary as fast as the moral sense of the Bench rises higher and higher in its perception of right and wrong. On this plan justice becomes as much "matter of accident" as Madame de Stael told Alexander safety was under a despotism. To Mr. Spooner's doctrine we may apply what was said on another occasion:

"If these principles prevail there are no longer any Pyrenees. Every bulwark and barrier of the Constitution is broken down; it becomes *tabula rasa, carte blanche*, for every one to scribble on what he pleases."—W. P.

The Anti-Slavery Movement in Delaware.

The following Preamble and Resolution have been adopted by the Legislature of Delaware. We may safely count upon her soon taking her place among the free States, and we trust, in reality, more anti-slavery than any of them. We count upon the reaction of public sentiment which is necessary to bring about emancipation:

Whereas, A crisis has arrived in the public affairs of this nation, which requires the free and full expression of the people, through their legal representatives; and Whereas, the United States is at war with a sister republic, occasioned by the Annexation of Texas, with a view to the addition of slave territory to our country, and the extending of slave power in our Union; and Whereas, in the opinion of this General Assembly, such acquisitions are hostile to the spirit of our free institutions, and contrary to sound morality. Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware in General Assembly met, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby requested to vote against the annexation of any territory to our Union, which shall not thereafter be forever free from Slavery.

The Wilmington "Blue Hen's Chicken," in publishing these resolutions, says:

Delaware would now have been a *free* State had it not been for the votes of Samuel Burnham and John D. Turner, in the Senate for New-Castle county, who voted for themselves instead of nine-tenths of their constituents. As it was, taking both branches of the Legislature together, sixteen voted for its abolition and thirteen *against* it. Had New-Castle county been *truly* represented in the State Senate, our State would have been free in name as it is in *fact*, and its splendid but neglected lands would have been worth *five millions of dollars* more this day, than they now are with the *badge of Slavery.* Kent did nobly.

By the following letter from the Tribune we learn that the Democratic party is as anti-democratic in Delaware as everywhere else:

STATE OF DELAWARE, March 2, 1847.

In the New-York Tribune of the first of March, you ask who will send you the *political* complexion of the Yeas and Nays in the Legislature of Delaware, on the bill for the gradual abolition of Slavery in that State. That bill passed the *Representative branch* in Delaware by a vote of nearly or about two to one—the Whigs all voting for it except two. In the Senate all the Whigs voted for it except one. With the exception of one Democrat, all the rest of that party voted against grade a abolition.

VERITAS.

W. W. Brown and A. B. Murch.

The last number of the Liberty Press contains an acknowledgment of a letter from A. B. Murch, in which he retracts the charge made in a former letter, and published in the Press, of falsehood against W. W. Brown. This last letter the Press refuses to publish. The first, the editor says, would not have been admitted had he not been absent. But having been admitted, is he not bound also to give the reasons for the retraction of Mr. Murch? An editor who cares more for truth than he does for party it seems to us would not hesitate to do so. The Press, however, not only refuses to let its readers see the evidence which has convinced Mr. Murch of his error, but endeavours to persuade them that the evidence itself is good for nothing. He says:

"We cheerfully grant the use of our columns to Mr. Murch to withdraw all that he has said of Mr. Brown, but our columns are not open to the dissemination of the slanders of the Garrisonian lecturers, and the waste of paper for their refutation. Some lies are so foolish and the iniquity of the motives for relating them so obvious, that we do not deem an attempted refutation worth the ink and paper."

That is, it will permit Mr. Murch to say he believes he was wrong, but it had rather that its readers should not believe so. It will not even allow them the privilege of judging for themselves. Mr. Murch's first letter has created an impression which the Press thinks it would injure the party to have effaced. It loves the lie. The reverend gentleman who edits that paper should remember the distinction between an editor and a priest. An editor is supposed to believe that his readers are capable of judging for themselves in a case of right and wrong. The opposite doctrine is tolerated in the pulpit, but he may be assured that if he thus forgets when in the arm-chair that he is not in the desk, his readers may insist that his only legitimate sphere is in the latter position.

The Three Million Bill—Defeat of the Wilmot Proviso.

The following is the Three Million Bill as it finally passed the two houses of Congress. We copy it, as it differs somewhat from the bill that was at first prepared:

AN ACT appropriating three millions of dollars to enable the Presicent to conclude a treaty of peace and limits with Mexico.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whereas, a state of war now exists between the United States and the republic of Mexico, which it is desirable should be speedily terminated upon terms just and honourable to both nations; and whereas, assurances have heretofore been given to the Government of Mexico that it was the desire of the President to settle all questions between the two countries on the most liberal and satisfactory terms, according to the rights of each and the mutual interests and security of the two countries; and whereas, the President may be able to conclude a treaty of peace with the republic of Mexico prior to the next session of Congress, if means for that object are at his disposal; and whereas, in the adjustment of so many complicated questions as now exist between the two countries, it may possibly happen that an expenditure of money may be called for by the stipulations of any treaty that may be entered into; therefore, the sum of three millions of dollars be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the President to conclude a treaty of peace, limits, and boundaries with the republic of Mexico, to be used by him in the event that said treaty, when signed by the authorized agents of the two Governments, and duly ratified by Mexico, shall call for the expenditure of the same, or any part thereof; full and accurate accounts for which expenditure shall be by him transmitted to Congress at as early a day as practicable.

We stated last week that the bill passed the Senate, but that the Wilmot Proviso was rejected. The following is the vote in the Senate:

YEAS—Messrs Allen, Atherton, Cameron, Cilley, John M. Clayton, Corwin, Davis, Dayton, Dix, Evans, Fairfield, Green, Huntington, Miller, Niles, Phelps, Simmons, Sturgeon, Upham, Webster, and Woodbridge—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Archer, Ashley, Atchison, Badger, Bagby, Benton, Berrien, Breese, Bright, Butler, Calhoun, Cass, Chalmers, Colquit, Crittenden, Dickenson, Hannegan, Houston, Jarnagin, Johnson of Maryland, Johnson of Louisiana, Lewis, Mangum, Mason, Morehead, Pierce, Rusk, Sevier, Soulé, Turney, Westcott—31.

John M. Clayton it will be observed voted in its favour though from a Slave State. All honor to Delaware for her noble Representatives!

When the bill again came before the House in Committee of the Whole, on the last day of the session, Mr. Wilmot moved that the Proviso be added as an amendment; which motion was adopted, by ninety to eighty votes. But when the committee arose and [illegible] to the House, the previous question was moved, and the main question ordered and put, viz: Will the House agree to the amendment reported by the Committee of the Whole, (the Wilmot Proviso)? It was decided as follows:

YEAS—(For the Proviso.)

Maine—R. P. Dunlop, H. Hamlin, C. Sawtelle, J. F. Seamman, *Luther Severance*, H. Williams—6.

New Hampshire—James H. Johnson, Mace Moulton, Moses Norris—3.

Massachusetts—*J. Q. Adams, Amos Abbott, Geo. Ashmun, Jos. Grinnell, A. Hale, Ch. Hudson, D. P. King, J. Rockwell, Benj. Thompson, R. C. Winthrop,*—10.

Rhode Island—*L. H. Arnold, H. Y. Cranston*—2.

Connecticut—*James Dixon, J. D. Hubbard, John A. Rockwell, Truman Smith*—4.

Vermont—*Jacob Collamer*, P. Dillingham, jr. *Solomon Foot, George P. Marsh*—4.

New-York—H. Anderson, C. S. Benton, Wm. W. Campbell, *Ch. Carroll*, John F. Collin, John De Mott, S. S. Ellsworth, S. Gordon, Martin Grover, *E. B. Holmes*, Wm. J. Hough, O. Hungerford, *Wash'n Hunt*, Tim. Jenkins, Preston King, John W Lawrence, *Abner Lewis*, Wm. B. Maclay, Wm S. Miller, *Wm. A. Moseley*, A. C. Niven, Geo. Rathbun, *Thos. C. Ripley*, H. I. Seaman, H. Wheaton, *Hugh White*, B. R. Wood—27.

New Jersey—*J. G. Hampton, John Runk*, George Sykes, *Wm. Wright*—4.

Pennsylvania—John H. Campbell, *C. Darrauge, J. J. H. Ewing, J. R. Ingersoll*, L. C. Levin, *James Pollock, Alex. Ramsey*, John Ritter, *Andrew Stewart, John Strohm*, David Wilmot, Jacob S. Yost—12.

Delaware—*John W. Houston*—1.

Ohio—Jacob Brinkerhoff, J. D. Cummins, *C. Delano*, George Fries, *Joshua R. Giddings, Alex. Harper*, Jno. J. McDowell, Aug. L Perrill, *Jos. M. Root, R. C. Schenck*, D. A. Starkweather, Allen G. Thurman, *Joseph Vance, Sam. F. Vinton*—14.

Indiana—Ch. W. Catheart, And. Kennedy, *Edw. W. McGaughey*, John Pettet, *Caleb B. Smith*—5.

Illinois—*John Henry*, John Wentworth—2.

Michigan—Jas. S. Hunt, R. McClelland—2.

Total 97—(96 from Free, 1 from a Slave State.)

NAYS—(Against the Proviso.)

New-York—Stephen Strong, Joseph Russell, W. W. Woodworth—3.

Pennsylvania—James Black, Richard Broadhead, Jacob Erdman, Henry D Foster, Wm S Garvin Cahs. J Ingersoll, Moses McClean, James Thompson—8.

New Jersey—Joseph E. Edsall—1.

Ohio—Fr. Cunningham, Joseph Morris, Isaac Parish, William Sawyer—4.

Indiana—Thos. J. Henley, Robert Dale Owen, Wm. W. Wick—3.

Illinois—Stephen A. Douglass, Robert Smith—2.

Michigan—John S. Chipman—1.

Maryland—*John G. Chapman*, Wm. F. Giles, Thos. W. Ligon, *Edward Long*, Thomas Perry—5.

Virginia—Arch. Atkinson, Thos. H. Bayly, Henry Bedinger, Wm. G Brown, Aug. A. Chapman, Geo. W. Hopkins, Edm. W. Hubard, Rob. M. THunter, Joseph Johnson, Shelton F. Leake, *John S. Pendleton*, James A. Seddon, Wm. M. Tredway—13.

North Carolina—*Dan. M. Barringer*, John R. J. Daniel, *Alfred Dockery, James Graham*, James J. McKay, David S. Reid—8.

South Carolina—J. A. Black, Armistead Burt, Isaac E Holmes, R. Barnwell Rhett, Alex D. Sims, Rich F. Simpson, Jo. A. Woodward—7.

Georgia—Howell Cobb, Seaborn Jones, *Thos. Butler King*, John H. Lumpkin, Geo. W. Towns—5.

Alabama—Fr. W. Bowdon, Reuben Chapman, J. L. F. Cottrell, Edm. S. Dargan, *Henry W. Hilliard*, Geo. S. Houston, W. W. Payne—7.

Mississippi—Stephen Adams, Henry T. Elliott, Rob. W. Roberts, Jacob Thompson—4.

Florida—William H. Brockenbrough—1.

Louisiana—John M. Harmanson, Emile La Sère, Isaac E. Morse, *Bannon G. Thibodeaux*—4.

Kentucky—*Joshua F. Bell*, Linn Boyd, *Garret Davis*, John P Martin, *John H. McHenry, Wm. P. Thomasson*, John W. Tibbatts; *Andrew Trumbo, Bryan R. Young*—9.

Tennessee—*Milton Brown*, Lucien B. Chase, *Wm. M. Cocke, John H. Crozier*, Alvan Cullom, *Edwin H. Ewing, Meredith P. Gentry*, Andrew Johnson, Geo. W. Jones, Barclay Martin, Fred. P. Stanton—11.

Missouri—James B. Bowlin, Wm. M. McDaniel, James S. Relfe, Leonard H. Sims—4.

Arkansas—*Thomas W. Newton*—1.

Texas—David Kaufman, Timo. Pillsbury—2.

Iowa—S. Deffer—1.

Total 102—22 from Free, 80 from Slave States.

Of these *all* the Nays from the free States—twenty-two—are of the Democratic party. The five who voted for it before, when it passed the House, but who on Wednesday last voted against it, are:

W. W. WOODWORTH, of New-York.
JOSEPH RUSSELL, "
JAMES THOMPSON, of Pennsylvania.
JOSEPH E. EDSALL, of New Jersey.
THOMAS J. HENLEY, of Indiana.

These men, we should say, had won for themselves an immortality of infamy had there not been so many candidates for that distinction within a few years past, that in the crowd they may be forgotten. At any rate we give them the benefit of a distinctive mark as we pass.

ALL the Whigs—forty-seven—from the free States, voted YEA. The single Yea from a slave State—JOHN W. HOUSTON, of Delaware—is also a Whig. As he is re-elected to Congress, we trust that he may, as he deserves, represent before his term is out, a State that has abolished Slavery. With the exception of Mr. Houston, the entire whig delegation of the South voted *nay*. This of course was to be expected. The South forgets party when Slavery is in question. It is the North only that clings to party, and forgets Liberty. This also was to be expected. It has always been so since the Union existed, and when it ceases to be so while Slavery exists, the Union will cease also.

Of the Democratic party from the free States forty-four voted *Yea*, and twenty-one *Nay*.

The following are the names of those who were absent or did not vote. Had they all voted, however, according to the local division between the free and the slave States, it would not have changed the result. It was only necessary to buy, or whip in, the five traitors, whose names stand recorded as infamous.

ABSENT, OR DID NOT VOTE,

Maine—J. D. McCrate—1.

New-York—E. D. Culver, C. Goodyear, Albert Smith, T. M. Woodruff—4.

Pennsylvania—John Blanchard, Jos. Buffington, A. R. McIlvaine, O. D. Leib—4.

Ohio—J. J. Faran, D. R. Tilden, H. St. John—3.

Indiana—Thomas Smith, John W. Davis, (Speaker)—3.

Illinois—J. F. Hoge, O. B. Ficklin, J. A. McClernand—3.

Virginia—G. C. Dromgoole, Jas. McDowell—2.

North Carolina—Asa Briggs, H. S. Clarke, Joseph C. Dobbin—2.

Georgia—H. A. Haralson, A. H. Stephens, Robert Toombs—3.

Louisiana—B. G. Thibodeaux—1

Kentucky—Henry Grider—1

Missouri—John S Phelps—1

Maryland—A. Constable—1

Iowa—S. C. Hastings—1. Total 30.

The Yeas and Nays on the final passage of the bill are as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Stephen Adams, Atkinson, Bayly, Bedinger, Benton, James Black, James A. Black, Bowdon, Bowlin, Boyd, Brockenburgh, Broadhead, William G. Brown, Burt, John H. Campbell, Catheart, Augustus A. Chapman, Reuben Chapman, Chase, Chipman, Cobb, Collin, Cottrell, Cullum, Cummins, Cunningham, Daniel, Dargan, De Mott, Dobbin, Douglass, Dromgoole, Dunlap, Edsall, Ellet, Ellsworth, Erdman, Faran, Ficklin, Fries, Garvin, Giles, Gordon, Harmanson, Henley, I. E. Holmes, Hopkins, Hough, Geo. S. Houston, Edmund W. Hubbard, Hungerford James B. Hunt, Hunter, Charles J. Ingersoll, Jenkins, James H. Johnson, Joseph Johnson, Andrew Johnson, George W. Jones, Seaborn Jones, Kaufman Kennedy, Lawrence Leake, Leffler La Sére, Ligon, Lumpkin, McClean, McClelland, McCrate, McDaniel, Joseph J. McDowell, McKay, J. P. Martin, B. Martin, Morris, Morse, Newton, Niven, Norris, Owen, Parish, Payne, Perrill, Perry, Pillsbury, Reid, Relf, Rhett, Ritter, Roberts, Russell, Sawtelle, Scammon, Seddon, A. D. Sims, Leonard H. Sims, Simpson, Robert Smith, Stanton, Starkweather, Strong, Sykes, James, Thompson, Jacob Thompson, Thurman, Tibbatts, Towns, Tredway, Wick, Williams, Woodward, Woodworth, Yost—115.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, John Quincy Adams, Arnold, Ashmun, Barringer, Bell, Brinkerhoff, Milton, Brown, Ington, William W. Campbell, Carroll, John G. Chapman, Cocke, Collamer, Cranston, Crozier, Darragh, Delano, Dixon, Dockery, John H. Ewing, Edwin H. Ewing, Foot, Gentry, Giddings, Graham, Grinnell, Grover, Hale, Hamlin, Hampton, Harper, Henry, Hilliard, Hoge, Elias B. Holmes, John W. Houston, Samuel D. Hubbard, Hudson, Washington Hunt, Joseph R. Ingersoll, Daniel P. King, Preston King, Thomas Butler King, Lewis, Long, McGaughey, McHenry, McIlvaine, Marsh, Miller, Moseley, Moulton, Pendleton, Pollock, Ramsey, Ripley, Julius Rockwell, Jno. A. Rockwell, Root, Runk, Schenck, Seaman, Severance, Truman Smith, Albert Smith, Caleb B. Smith, Stewart, Strohm, Thomasson, Benjamin Thompson, Trumbo, Vance, Vinton, Wentworth, Wheaton, White, Wilmot, Winthrop, Wood, Wright, Young—82.

We add, now, the rejected Proviso, that the relation of this last act of the republic of the United States may be complete. There is not a blacker page in her history. We wish we could indulge the hope that there never will be. But what hope can there be till the people learn that the only safety for Liberty is in "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

"Provided, That there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any territory on the continent of America which shall hereafter be acquired by or annexed to the United States by virtue of this appropriation, or in any other manner whatever, except for crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: Provided always, That every person escaping into such territory from whom labour or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the United States, such fugitive may be lawfully claimed and conveyed out of said territory to the power claiming his or her labour or services"

Congress—The Last Day.

As usual, Congress did a good deal of business on the last day of the session. A great number of bills were disposed of, but which are of no especial interest, except to those immediately concerned. The following are the most important acts, passed and not passed:

The rejection of an appropriation of $60,000, for a remuneration to the owners of the Amistad. For this, great credit is due to Messrs. Adams and Giddings.

The Irish Relief Bill was lost in the Senate. Such a Bill, it was argued, is unconstitutional. The truth is, the Government has too much need of its funds to pay for the murder of the Mexicans, to spare any to feed the starving millions of Ireland.

Mr. C. J. Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania, was rejected by the Senate, as Minister to France.

The President neglected to sign the River and Harbor Bill.

The House agreed to the striking out of the Army Bill the resolution giving the President power to appoint an officer to the command of the army.

A long list of civil and military appointments were made and confirmed, of which the following are the most important:

Appointments by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.—David Tod, Ohio, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near his Majty the Emperor of Brazil, *vice* Henry A. Wise, recalled at his own request.

Jos R. Clay, Chargé d'Affairs at Peru.

Richard Rush, of Pennsylvania, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to his Majesty the King of France.

George W. Hopkins, of Virginia, Chargé d'Affairs of the United States, to the Queen of Portugal.

Major Generals—Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, Wash Cumming, of Georgia.

Brigadier Generals—George Cadwallader, of Pennsylvania, Enos D. Hoppin, of New-York, Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire.

"Grace Greenwood."

A young lady has written a long letter to the Charter-ite, commenting upon the remarks made in this paper, upon her letter to the Illustrated Magazine, and which we had some weeks since. She is most deeply offended. Why, we cannot conceive, except, indeed, it be that she wished a letter which was written, not for Abolitionists, but for the "world's people." The fault, in that case, was not ours, for copying, but hers for writing. A thing to be ashamed of, or that, for any reason, had better not be known to a certain class of people, should not be told in the pages of a periodical, that anybody can buy for a shilling. We beg leave, however, to assure her most sincerely, that nothing was further from our thought than to offend or wound her. She stated, as it seemed to us, in very unequivocal terms, her mental and moral experience. We believed her even deeply sorrowful—for such was the tone of her letter—that she yielded to the advice and solicitations of short-sighted friends, and gave up her labours of love in a noble cause, to devote herself to the ephemeral literature of the day. And we expressed our surprise that she should have chosen this path, though, for reasons, which others as well as ourself, can conjecture, she sees fit to leave out this portion of our remarks, and thereby conveys a wrong impression to her readers as to our motive.

We also would assure her, that she need not have gone to any other paper than this, in which to seek readers for what she conceives to be her wrongs. We would have published—and will publish now, if she wishes it,—the letter, in the Charter Oak, although we think it very far from doing credit to her good sense or good temper.

The Northern Traitors.

We repeat below, the names of the Senators and Representatives from the free States, who basely and wickedly voted against the Proviso, the sole object of which, was to prevent the extension of human slavery over a vast country, now inhabited by a free people. It will, we trust, be sufficient to say of each of them, whenever they appear before the people, as candidates for political advancement—HE VOTED AGAINST THE WILMOT PROVISO This punishment they will feel, however deaf they may be to the voice of humanity.

SENATORS.

DANIEL S. DICKINSON, of New-York.
EDWARD A. HANNEGAN, of Indiana.
JESSE D. BRIGHT, do.
SIDNEY BREESE, of Illinois.
LEWIS CASS, of Michigan.

REPRESENTATIVES.

NEW-YORK.	OHIO.
STEPHEN STRONG,	FRS. A. CUNNINGHAM,
W. W. WOODWORTH,	JOSEPH MORRIS,
JOSEPH RUSSELL.	ISAAC PARISH,
PENNSYLVANIA.	WILLIAM SAWYER,
JAMES THOMPSON,	HENRY ST. JOHN.
RICHARD BROADHEAD,	INDIANA.
JAMES BLACK,	WM. W. WICK,
JACOB ERDMAN,	ROBERT D. OWEN,
HENRY D. FOSTER,	THOMAS J. HENLEY.
WILLIAM S. GARVIN,	ILLINOIS.
CHARLES J. INGERSOLL,	ORLANDO B. FICKLIN,
MOSES M'CLEAN.	STEPHEN A DOUGLASS,
NEW JERSEY.	ROBERT SMITH,
JOSEPH EDSALL.	A. MCCLERNAND.
MICHIGAN.	IOWA.
JOHN S. CHIPMAN.	SHEPPERD LEFFLER.

THE LIBERTY PARTY SENATOR.—The Anti-Slavery Bugle, publishes the following letter from Mr. Cilley, the Liberty party Senator from New Hampshire. It tells its own story. We think we could pick out half a dozen Whig Senators, and a score or two of Representatives of both parties who have more respect for the right of the people to petition their public servants, and courage enough to maintain that right. Can sober and earnest Anti-Slavery men believe much longer that anything can be done for the slave by a party which in its infancy is obliged to content itself with so poor an apology for an Abolitionist as this New-Hampshire Senator. We hope this letter will be widely copied:

WASHINGTON, Feb. 13, 1847.

Dear Sir:

As I am not yet in favour of a Dissolution of the Union of the United States, I return the petitions directed to me with a request to present them to the Senate of the United States.

Yours, Respectfully,
J. CILLEY.

BENJ. S. JONES, Esq.
Salem, Ohio.

☞ The Boston Atlas says that Ibrahim Pacha has given freedom to all the slaves in his own service. Its authority is a private letter from Egypt. We wish some of the heathen rulers in this country would follow his example.

ERROR.—It is not perhaps necessary to say that we inadvertently said Maryland instead of Delaware, last week in reference to the action of her Senate on the question of Slavery.

☞ We have received the first number of a small sheet, called "The Tempest," which is to be devoted to the interest of the coloured people. The immediate abolition of Slavery it promises to make its most prominent object. Something of a tempest is needed among the coloured people of this city to arouse them to their duty on this subject, and this one, we trust, will succeed.

☞ We are indebted to Mr. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, for a copy of his speech on the Three Million Appropriation Bill and the Mexican War.

☞ In the Legislature of this State, Mr. Gould, in behalf of the Committee to which the subject was referred, has reported a bill for the abolition of Capital Punishment.

To Correspondents.

S. S. He will find by the bills sent that his account is correct.

S. S. F. We should have done so at the time, but we had no room, and we are no less crowded now. Still it shall be done if possible. We agree with him that it is the best thing that ever came there.

E. S. E. of C. This request is, as any similar one would be, of course, complied with with great pleasure. Our correspondent must know that he would be an editor thrice blessed who never had a more unreasonable one asked of him. We beg him to understand, however, that his quotation is far from being an apt one in the comparison: We are a tee-totaller, and democratic all to rags.

This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry:* The Hebrew's Prayer. *Miscellany:* Toussaint (continued); Memoir of Wm. Lloyd Garrison (concluded); Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

FIRST PAGE.—*Communications:* Convention at West Winfield; Cazenovia Anti-Slavery Convention. *Selections:* Intrepid Action and Narrow Escape; Congress.

SECOND PAGE.—Contributions for Ireland; Anti-Slavery Movement in Delaware; Bible for the Slave.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

Late from Mexico.—By an arrival at New Orleans news has been received of the reported evacuation of Vera Cruz, and that Santa Anna was about to march on Saltillo, preparatory to an attack on Monterey. Gen

Poetry.

From the Devil's Progress.

THE HEBREW'S PRAYER.

BY T. K. HERVEY.

A Hebrew knelt in the dying light;
His eye was dim and cold;
The hairs on his brow were silver-white,
And his blood was thin and old;
He lifted his book to his latest sun,
For he knew that his pilgrimage was done;
And as he saw God's *shadow** there,
His spirit poured itself in prayer.

"I come unto Death's second-birth,
Beneath a stranger-air,
A pilgrim on a dull cold earth,
As all my fathers were;
And men have stamped me with a curse,—
I feel it is not *Thine*;
Thy mercy, like yon sun, was made
On me as them to shine;
And therefore dare I lift mine eye
Through that to Thee, before I die.

In this great temple built by Thee,
Whose altars are divine,—
Beneath yon lamp, that ceaselessly
Lights up Thine own true shrine,—
Oh take my latest sacrifice!
Look down and make this sod
Holy as that, where, long ago,
The Hebrew met his God.

I have not caused the widow's tears,
Nor dimmed the orphan's eye;
I have not stained the virgin's years,
Nor mocked the mourner's cry;
The songs of Zion in mine ear
Have ever been most sweet,
And always when I felt Thee near,
'My shoes were off my feet.'

I have known Thee in the whirlwind,
I have known Thee on the hill,
I have loved Thee in the voice of bird,
Or the music of the rill;
I dreamed Thee in the shadow,
I saw Thee in the light,
I heard Thee in the thunder-peal,
And worshipped in the night:
All beauty, while it spoke of Thee,
Still made my soul rejoice,
And my spirit bowed within itself,
To hear Thy "still small voice."
I have not felt myself a thing
Far from Thy presence driven,—
By flaming sword, or waving wing,
Shut out from Thee and Heaven;—
Must I the whirlwind reap, because
My fathers sowed the storm?
Or sink, because another sinned,
Beneath Thy red right-arm?
Oh! much of this we dimly scan,
And much is all unknown,
But I will not take my curse from *man*,
I turn to Thee alone!
Oh! bid my fainting spirit live,
And what is dark reveal,
And what is evil, oh! forgive,
And what is broken heal!
And cleanse my nature from above
In the deep Jordan of Thy love.

I know not if the Christian's heaven
Shall be the same as mine—
I only ask to be forgiven,
And taken home to Thine:
I weary on a far dim strand,
Whose mansions are as tombs,
And long to find the father-land,
Where there are many homes,
Oh! grant of all yon starry thrones,
Some dim and distant star,
Where Judah's lost and scattered sons
May love Thee from afar,
Where all earth's myriad harps shall meet
In choral praise and prayer,
Shall Zion's harp, of old so sweet,
Alone be wanting there?
Yet place me in thy lowest seat,
Though I, as now, be, there
The Christian's scorn, the Christian's jest,—
But let me see and hear
From some dim mansion in the sky,
Thy bright ones and their melody."

The sun goes down with sudden gleam,
And, beautiful as a lovely dream,
And silently as air,
The vision of a dark-eyed girl,
With long and raven hair,
Glides in, as guardian spirits glide,
And lo! is kneeling by his side,—
As if her sudden presence there
Were sent in answer to his prayer.
(Oh! say they not that angels tread
Around the good man's dying bed?)
His child—his sweet, and sinless child!
And as he gazed on her,
He knew his God was reconciled,
And this the messenger:
As sure as God had hung on high
The promise-bow before his eye,
Earth's purest hope thus o'er him flung,
To point his heaven-ward faith,
And life's most holy feeling strung
To sing him into death;
And on his daughter's stainless breast
The dying Hebrew sought his rest.

* Plato calls Truth the body of God, and Light his shadow.

Miscellany.

TOUSSAINT:
AN HISTORICAL ROMANCE.

(From an unpublished Translation from the German of Theodore Mügge.)

CHAPTER XVI.—[CONCLUDED.]

The little Doctor held his hand to shade his eyes, as he cast a grim look at the Priest, who disturbed him in the midst of his exalted calling. But the negroes had no sooner recognized the good father, than, regarding him as a guardian angel, they made him their bulwark against their dreaded foe, and crowded behind him at the door.

"Do you come here," cried the Doctor, in great wrath, "to encourage these black creatures in their unreasonableness? I am head physcian, and must best know what is for the good of my patients. You heal their souls, I must answer for their bodies, but it is here, as it is in your domain, Mr. Priest; all want to be well, all would be saved, but no one wants to swallow the bitter draught which contains life and salvation."

"Friend," said the Priest, with great gravity, "there are draughts of which even the pious Christian may well doubt whether it would not be better to renounce salvation at once than consent to take them, and so in case of one's temporal weal, one might well hesitate to take, unless by extreme force, a mixture of snakes livers, and toads spawn, and Heaven knows what horrible ingredients from all the three kingdoms of Nature."

"Fudge!" said the Doctor, and he thrust the spoon with his medicine, right under the nose of the Priest, who started back with such horror that he nearly fell to the ground; "superstition is always found among the clergy. Do you really believe, then, what this silly creature has said, who it seems, with all his folly, has got sense enough left to turn the heads of negroes and Priests. How can we get here cinchorya in the wilderness, balsams, jalap, and all the materia medica which a well-provided apothecary keeps in his hundred and thousand boxes, and which they cram into the human stomach? My apothecary is Nature," he continued, proudly. "I wander over the country, and, with my bold servant here, seek the raw herbs and roots, and this beautiful mixture, which a King might be proud of, is despised only by these black asses, who, like all the rude children of Nature, have an unconquerable dislike of all medicine." And here he suddenly broke out with a terrible oath, and stamping with his foot upon the floor—"Where are they all gone, the ingrates," he cried, and ran to the door, "off, escaped, but patience, they shall not lose the benefit of my art. Halloo! you brainless fellow," he added, giving his attendant a smart blow over the head, "wake up, and drive the herd together again, it is the only sense that is left to thee."

The stupid human figure raised his head and stared gloomily at the Doctor and the strangers. He then stroked away his tangled hair from his face and fastened his eyes upon Vincent, who was now gazing in his turn, upon the unhappy creature. "How!" cried Vincent, "is not this Valsain, former overseer of the Plantation Breda?"

"And is not this my young friend?" said the Doctor, joyfully grasping the hand of his guest, whom he now recognized as the gentleman who visited the beautiful Breda, and the philosophical coachman the day before the Insurrection. Vincent confirmed his discovery, and the especial liking, which the Doctor had formerly expressed for the young officer, was all revived again. With great interest, he inquired after Vincent's fortunes, and scarcely had he cast a glance at his bandaged head, when he forgot his favourite medicine and all his black patients, and made instant preparations to examine the wound. He set Vincent down upon a chair, and notwithstanding all the ridicule of the Priest of Dondon, the old man showed that he had a skilful hand. With a small pair of scissors, he clipped the hair from the injured place, and after a sufficient examination, declared that the axe which had struck the skull, had only occasioned a pretty severe bruise, which was by no means dangerous. He then ran out and immediately returned with an essence, with which he washed the wound, and while he was binding it up, he related his own and Valsain's history. "As for myself," said he, "I have never been so well off as in my present situation, as Chief Physcian of the black army. What care I for their cruelties, or their stupidity in making Spanish Dons of themselves? I have lived here in this retired valley, now for some weeks, which have slipped away like minutes. I have my hands full,—most wonderful cases, the most singular injuries, which furnish opportunity for the whole skill of the physician. But a perfect show-piece of art have I here," he continued, "in this Valsain, my present *Famulus*. The fury of the blacks had covered him with the most deadly injuries, before Toussaint could prevent them. There he lay, the huge, clumsy creature, with broken limbs, and head smashed, among the smoking ruins, and the black rascals would not deliver him over to me. They danced round his body, which was insensible to their kicks and thumps. With great trouble, and with the assistance of the coachman—I beg pardon, the Colonel I mean," said he, smiling, "we dragged him into a hut, and I laid myself out to preserve his worthless life. I succeeded wonderfully with the body. That all healed up nicely, and become as strong and healthy as ever, but the spirit, the mind, of which, by the way, I never thought he had a great abundance, that had fled altogether through the cracks they made in his scull. The wild rogue is now become a quiet, thoughtful creature, but a very useful and faithful creature too. He follows all my steps with a sort of instinct like a dog; does whatever I command, and of all his former bad habits, he has retained nothing but a peculiar liking for the blacks whom, as my faithful assistant, he now constrains to their good. It is a pleasure to see how this penchant awakens in him a sort of sense, how he rouses up, when a black fellow is brought in to me, how he runs for knife or saw, if it is necessary; how he ties their limbs together with real Esculapian joy, how his big eyes sparkle, how unwearingly he labours and runs in order to prepare doses or mix salves, and how strictly he insists upon my patients swallowing every drop that I order."

While his master was thus speaking, the attendant sate perfectly motionless, fixing his large eyes inquiringly upon him. His huge form, clad in a ragged jacked and a tattered pair of grey pantaloons, the remains of a suit, such as the slaves had been accustomed to wear on festival days, awakened the strangest emotions. This man, who, a short time before, would not have touched a slave's dress for any consideration, now wore the rags, which had been left behind by some deceased black. He had lost all recollection of his previous life. Nothing remained of his former self but the cruel pleasure of witnessing the sufferings of the hated negroes, and instinctively he followed the Doctor, whom he had once despised and laughed at, because thereby his love of seeing the blacks suffer might be gratified. With abhorrence, and yet with sympathy, Vincent contemplated the poor wretch, and observed how his sunken features, deeply impressed with traces of suffering, and fearfully scarred, would now and then take the old bitter smile, and then suddenly resume their new wonted expression of pain and melancholy. It seemed as if thoughts of the past flitted at intervals through the ruins of his mind, tormenting or pleasing him. Then again he would shake himself, and his eyes would sparkle; and he would press his hand to his head, as if he were trying to remember something long before forgotten, and a sudden pain prevented him; his right hand played, convulsively with his long, black beard; a terrible despair spoke out though his dull moan, and the insane flash of his eye; and then his hands sank down, and he became stupid as ever.

The little Doctor would have continued to talk on still longer, but he was interrupted by a tall, stout black, who hastily entered, greeting the Priest with all due respect, and then stepping up to Vincent, whom he regarded with no friendly looks. Vincent recognized him immediately. It was Moses, the nephew of Toussaint. He wore the uniform of a Captain, with a large bandage round his head, which covered his left eye. "Mr. Officer," said he, "my uncle has thought good to send me to bid you welcome. He reached his house a few minutes ago, and he wishes to see you."

"I am happy," replied Vincent, with European politeness, "to see the nephew of my noble friend." And he extended his hand to Moses, but the latter drew proudly back.

"Do we not know each other?" said he menacingly. "Was it not on the first night of our freedom that I saw you? Enough, Sir, Moses can call no white man friend, and least of all you."

"Me!" said Vincent. "And what have I done to excite your hatred?"

The negro looked at him with a flashing eye. His animated features expressed a strong internal conflict, and through his black skin, the glow of his blood was visible. "The hour will come, when I will speak," said he. "Moses loves not to hide his thoughts, but he is true as the stars of heaven, he will speak with the white officer. But now follow me to Toussaint Breda, it is his command."

"Wait, my child," cried the Doctor, "wait and let me look at your eye." And he ran towards the young negro; his huge Famulus roused himself and ran to the door, leaned his body against it and watched his master and the negro with the eagerness of a hound, ready, at the first hint, to dart upon the game.

Moses was, however, in nowise intimidated. "Away with the crazy monster," said he. "Massa Bertrand, bid him get out of the way, or Moses will have to kill him, although he does not deserve death." Why does the little Doctor wish to see my eye?" he continued. "The bullet of a white man has forever extinguished its light, and Massa Bertrand has no magic to kindle it anew."

"I want to make you an eye of wax," said the Doctor confidentially; "and we will afterwards order one of glass, from Paris, so natural that no one can tell it."

"Shall I be able to see with your glass eye," said he negro.

"Ah," cried Bertrand, "an eye of glass has great advantages. It would make you a wonder of nature, if we shall order a light blue, to match that other black one of yours. Only think, my son, a negro with a heaven-blue eye—how that will delight all the beauties! Besides, it will never do any harm, no matter what gets into it, and one can keep his eye wide open to everything, and yet never have to blush or be ashamed. No one can ever say that you wink at anything, nor will its virtue ever fail. It will never grow tired, never be plagued with inflamation or sickness; never be made red with silly tears."

"Enough, you fool, with your everlasting tongue," cried Moses, angrily. "Tell me, can I see with your glass eye?"

"That is the only thing," replied the Doctor, with evident vexation, "that it lacks, the only thing which has not yet been found out; but none but a stupid negro would expect everything from our noble art. Could one see with glass eyes, my child, all the world would be tearing out their natural eyes, for what a convenience it would be to see or be blind at pleasure, and what would not the ladies give if there were a fashion in eyes, and they could change grey or green eyes as they pleased, into blue, brown, or black, and buy them of all kinds in packages by the dozen just like gloves."

"The negro looked at the little man with the utmost contempt. "There, see you," said he, and seized Charles Belair by the hand, "see, how false everything is which comes from the white men, and yet our illustrious uncle and yourself admire them so much." With this, he retired, and the Priest of Dondon, who had been contending all the while with his cough, led Vincent across the spacious courtyard. Beautiful horses, of the Spanish mountain breed, were there led about by black servants, and Vincent admired the skill with which they were evidently selected, and which reminded him that their present possessor had spent this life, until very recently, in a stable. At the door of the house, stood black guards, who gave way at the command of Moses, who conducted the strangers through a room covered with coloured mats, and arranged with evident elegance, into a large saloon, where a strange spectacle awaited Vincent.

CHAPTER XVII.

It was a richly decorated room, set out with the costliest plunder of the whites, like Jeannot's den, but with a difference. Here were no traces of that Vandal confusion, which jumbled the choicest works of art with the merest rubbish, and estimated the value of things with a childish ignorance. Appropriate furniture stood round the walls. Cushioned seats and silken couches, chandeliers hanging from the ceiling, tables of mosaic work, with beautiful vases and costly ware, laid out upon a table, which appeared to be waiting for guests, occupied the centre of the room; and everywhere a spirit of order was visible. It appeared, indeed, upon closer inspection, that the beautiful furniture was a good deal injured, the chairs and seats broken, the ware cracked, branches of the chandeliers missing, and the silken coverings torn. Upon the whole, the tasteful arrangement of the room had a pleasing look, especially for one who had just come from witnessing how the objects of luxury may be perverted from their use, by the brutal ignorance of a parcel of half-savages. As Vincent was casting a glance around the room, a door on the opposite side opened, and Toussaint entered, with his negro wife on his arm, in a white muslin frock, surrounded by his children, and carrying himself his youngest son. Behind him, followed a number of black officers and ladies. With looks full of affection, he hastened up to Vincent, and seized his hand with the proud bearing of a man who approaches his equal and his friend. "After sufferings of all kinds," said he, "welcome to the house of a friend, forget the future and the gloomy past, and share with us what we possess. And here, Eneria," he continued, "here is our friend, who is to be our guest for some time: my children, you must love him, he is your benefactor and your father's friend."

The lady was in some embarrassment to offer an appropriate greeting, and to find suitable words to address her guest. She was on the point, after the fashion of a slave, to cross her hands and bend her knee, when Toussaint remarked it and prevented her. She was evidently encumbered by the full, white frock, and nothing could be more ridiculous than the awkwardness with which, at last, she attempted a European curtsey. But suddenly, she seized Vincent's other hand, and said, in the heartiest way: "O! believe me, Massa Officer, I have never forgotten the day, when you appeared amongst us, like a being of another order. I have never ceased to pray for you. I thank God that I see you again. It is all I can say." Toussaint then greeted the Priest of Dondon, and called forward the ladies and gentlemen that accompanied him, and introduced them. They were his brothers, with their wives and children, a numerous kindred, the greater part of whom, had the distinguishing homeliness of feature which belongs to the genuine negro race. They all appeared to feel, however, that they belonged to the new aristocracy of the infant black nation. The women had tricked themselves out in all sorts of ornaments, and were casting upon one another looks of mutual satisfaction. Golden drops hung from their ears, and chains of gold were wound round their heads and arms, dresses of silk, and richly embroidered, without regard to their fitting, enveloped their dark forms, but, like their husbands and brothers, they had much to learn, before they could reach that refinement of culture to which their strong dispositions to imitate European forms, prompted them to aspire. Some of these black beauties appeared in rich ball dresses, but without shoes, others in shoes without stockings. Some had too little clothing, and some were in the contrary predicament, and appeared as if stuck in large sacks; but all regarded themselves with great pride, and seemed to think themselves infinitely beautiful and fascinating, and their sparkling eyes appeared to ask the white man whether he did not find them arrayed with much finer taste than the pale faces, from whom all these decorations had been inherited. But among the last that entered, a tall, graceful figure was visible, the only one who did not share in the passion for dress, which distinguished her associates. It was Aimé. A simple, dark-coloured frock enveloped her fine figure, a red sash set off her form to great advantage, and a short Spanish dagger at her side testified to the warlike disposition of this Amazon, no less than the fiery eye, which, with a mingling of reproach, and pride, and the soft light of pleasure, rested upon Vincent. "Aimé greets the white Massa Officer," said she, "and is rejoiced to see him among the black men. But why do you come alone?" she continued, with great animation, "who wishes to live lonely in the wilderness among the palms? Where is the white maiden who loves the handsome young massa? Has she gone home only to be forsaken? Has she not said: Aimé, my sister, I would be happy with thee?"

Vincent smiled at this rapid succession of questions. "Has Aimé forgotten," said he, "that the white maiden is tender as a reed, and cannot live in the wilderness, without being crushed by the first tornado?"

"I wish to hear," she replied, "how my fair young friend is. Tell me everything about her, Massa Officer."

When was a lover unwilling to talk about the object of his love? Vincent went on with all the ardour of passion to speak of the keen sorrow of separation, of the warmth of his love, and Aimé listened in silence, and her dark eye glistened with sympathy. She pressed his hand and said: "She will not perish, the beautiful lily, she shall not fade away in loneliness; the white man shall return to her, a black friend will tell her so, that her heart may beat calmly. Aimé knows well," she continued softly, "that a woman can die. Aimé has a strong heart, and yet she trembles, when he, whom she loves, seizes his sabre." At these words he extended her hand to the happy Charles Belair. But beside this affectionate pair, Vincent saw the gloomy Moses standing, who, with arms folded, leaned against the wall and was looking at Vincent with an expression of the utmost hate. The latter turned away, annoyed at the sight, and Toussaint, who had been whispering with the Priest of Dondon, now took Vincent's hand, and, while in kind and encouraging tones he begged him to dismiss all anxiety, he led him to the welcome table. The company proceeded now to take their places. The black officers led forward their ladies, who, with tongues all at once let loose, instantly began to chatter with one another, and, in their half intelligible native dialect, to exchange observations which, together with their burst of laughter and the various gesticulations corresponded not at all to their new rank but admirably to their general external appearance. To Vincent was appointed the place of honour between his protectors, and when the Priest had said grace, which was listened to by all with great apparent devotion, several black soldiers brought in large dishes, filled with various viands, which they placed before the lady of the house. Vincent met with entire good nature the thousand awkwardnesses which attended this family repast, but he could not help feeling the oddity of his situation, and, as he was from prejudices, yet he could hardly at times resist his inclination to laugh, and the natural disgust which an educated man could not suppress, at the beings about him, who, for the most part with an ape-like ludicrousness, were striving to adorn their untutored propensities. Vincent imagined to himself the utter despair of one of the proud Creoles, if, by any chance such an one had been forced to sit down at table with these caricatures of all civility; and for the moment Vincent's cotterie was strong of the impossibility of ever uniting the two races, let reason say what it might. Vincent could not help observing with admiration what apt scholars, so far as the mere handling of things was concerned, the blacks were. The bands, which held knife and fork so awkwardly, instantly sought to imitate his. And every one refrained from using his fingers, the moment it was noticed that the white man did not use his. He blew upon the hot Banana soup, and at once there arose a universal blowing, although to most of the company, the soup certainly was not too hot; he made use of his handkerchief, and all handkerchiefs were immediately in motion; he shook the fiery cayenne pepper upon a kind of ragout, made of various kinds of birds, and with the greatest celerity was his example followed on all sides. But notwithstanding the terrible faces they made over the food, thus highly seasoned, the ambitious blacks swallowed it down, encouraging each other the while, for who did not wish to do what the white gentleman did?

But cheered as Vincent was at this eager facility of imitation, he was still more pleased by the amiable traits evinced around him. Genuine goodness of heart, and a pleasing simplicity, spoke from the humble eyes and words of the wife of Toussaint, who, with a native sense of decorum, sate at his side and distributed the different dishes. She spoke of the events of her life to her guest, at intervals. She jested playfully with her children, spoke with a mother's fondness of their talents and abilities, and handed them various things, such as pomegranates and figs from her own plate. The glasses were now filled with different wines, for the Spanish and French blood of the grape stood round on the table in bottles of various shape, and the merry Priest of Dondon had directed a large bowl to be brought, and was squeezing lemons, and preparing the cool luscious drink, respecting the precise ingredients of which, and their due proportions, he was carrying on a profound dispute with the Physician-in-chief of his Catholic majesty who had also made his appearance after exchanging his cotton sorcerer's mantle for a brown Sunday dress, a little torn here and there, and only slightly stained. The contest between these ardent combatants had, however, little attraction for the negroes, who, instead of listening, applied themselves, with their wives and children, most industriously to the wine, and every moment were growing more animated. One, alone, preserved his sobriety. Toussaint's brow became perhaps only more serious, as the mirth around him grew more animated. He had taken scarcely any share in the festivities, and yet the table offered much to excite and gratify the appetite. Rice boiled in the fat broth of mutton, made still richer with butter, and coloured with sandal-wood, a dish in which all the blacks delighted, dishes of sweet potatoes and banana salads, beans, game, and meats, variously prepared, preserved fruits from Cuba, which were accounted great delicacies even on the tables of the richest planter, and which, no doubt, had once enriched some dainty store-room, covered the board. But this singular man declined all these delicacies, and confined himself to the sweet potato, with a small piece of meat and a glass of spring water, without touching the sparkling and foaming wines, which heated the heads of the others. He encouraged Vincent, however, to drink, with many friendly expressions, and when the latter would fill his host's glass also, Toussaint declined, remarking: "I hate and abhor all these intoxicating drinks, which you gentlemen from Europe love as much as do the negro of the desert, or the Indian to whom you have carried the ruinous poison. Truly, if the Creoles had not given to their slaves a decoction of the sugar-cane which made the savage nature stupid, our insurrection would have broken out a hundred years ago. When a child, I often saw the effect of this drunkenness, and I was filled with an unconquerable disgust. I had, perhaps, as great a talent for excess as the most of my companions, for I used to feel the greatest longing after sweet things and these dangerous drinks. But I never gave way to these low propensities: I extinguished all desire of this sort by the power which I felt I possessed to subdue it, and I found myself rewarded for it, when I saw those, who called me a slave, slaves themselves to a base appetite, reduced, without strength, without sense, to a parcel of miserable, silly, prating creatures, upon whom I could not but look down with contempt."

(*To be continued.*)

From the People's Journal.

MEMOIR OF WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

BY MARY HOWITT.

(*Concluded.*)

We give below the conclusion of Mrs. Howitt's Memoir of W. L. Garrison. Owing to some delay in England, the number of the People's Journal containing it was only received within the week:

The life of this truly great and good man has been so entirely devoted to the Anti-Slavery cause, that we cannot give a sketch of the one without tracing, in some measure, the progress of the other. The patience, the forbearance, the stedfast perseverance through good and through evil, the self-sacrifice, and self-renunciation, of the martyrs of emancipation, had drawn upon the cause the eyes of the whole country; and sympathy and conviction swelled their ranks every day, not with merely enthusiastic partisans, but with the most noble, the most intellectual, the most morally great men and women of the land.

In 1836, therefore, a new impetus was given to the Anti-Slavery movement, by the public labours of two remarkable women, who had become convinced of the guilt of slaveholding. These were Angelina and Sarah Grimke, the daughters of the late Honourable Thomas S. Grimke, an eminent citizen of South Carolina. By the death of their father, they inherited a large amount of slave property. In opposition to the laws of their country, in the first instance, they endeavoured to improve the condition of their slaves, by establishing schools among them, and introducing the habits of free society. But all their efforts were fruitless: the state of Slavery around them could neither permit nor make availing their humane labours. Sacrificing, therefore, their worldly interests to their conscientious sense of duty, they liberated their slaves, removed them to a free district, where they would be able to maintain themselves, and then, with the small remains of their once noble fortunes, came to Philadelphia; where, naturally allying themselves to the emancipation cause, they became the most active and influential of its movers. They had also embraced the religious opinions of the Society of Friends, which, among other things, gives to woman a moral responsibility hardly acknowledged, at least, as far as action goes, by other religious bodies. They had thus been accustomed to speak in public, and their style of speaking was singularly impressive. Angelina, in particular, was a close reasoner and most eloquent declaimer. Before long, they conceived that duty called them to speak publicly on the subject of Slavery—that system which from experience they knew to have horribly imbrued more than a million of their sex—and they, consequently, began to travel, and deliver their public testimony, both as Christian women and repentant slaveholders, against the enslavement of any portion of the human race. They came to Massachusetts, which became the principal field of their labours. At first, they addressed audiences composed exclusively of women; but so general became the curiosity to hear them, that immense assemblies of both sexes gathered wherever they spoke, and the most electric effects were produced by their energetic and powerful eloquence.

Alarmed at this strange innovation, and deeming it a dangerous precedent to be set to the women of the United States, the Calvinistic clergy of Massachusetts, connected with what is called "The General Association," issued a *bull* against them, in the name, and by the authority, of the apostle Paul, and warned the churches to give them no countenance in their unscriptural course! They defended themselves with great ability, and Sarah Grimke published an ably-written series of letters on the subject, entitled—"The Equality of the Sexes," which was the origin of what is called, in America, the "Woman's Rights Question," and which has become, as will be seen, mixed up with the emancipation movement. Of course, it was now necessary for the Abolitionists either to justify the course these powerful co-labourers were taking, or to join with the pro-slavery clergy in condemning and rejecting them. The great body of the Abolitionists, with Garrison at their head, bade them God speed! and thus established the principle of women being morally and politically equal to men. The clergy of the "orthodox" stamp still continued to show the most hostile spirit to the labours of women, and used every means in their power to get the management of the abolition cause into their own hands. They made a violent attempt at this in May, 1839, at the annual meeting of the "Anti-Slavery Society," in the city of New-York, by denying that female members had a right to take part in the proceedings; but in this they were fortunately defeated. They then announced that, if the question was still carried in opposition to their views at the next annual meeting, they would secede from the society altogether.

The time of that meeting came, and will ever be memorable in the annals of the Anti-Slavery cause in America. The clergy had exerted every influence in their power to insure an overwhelming attendance of such as held their views of the question. The meeting was immense. The question immediately came on. Abby Kelley's name was proposed. She was a member of the Society of Friends, one of the most gifted and self-sacrificing of women, a noble creature in the noblest sense of the word, and one who has, since then, done more by her public lectures, and extraordinary labours, towards the overthrow of Slavery, than any other lecturer whatever. She is one of those who, in the unshrinking achievement of good works, deserved, and will obtain, immortal honour. Such are the glorious women who have come forth on this extraordinary movement, clearly proving their own moral and intellectual greatness, whilst they undermine the strongholds of Slavery, prejudice, and self-interest. The question was—should Abby Kelley sit on the committee? A large majority of votes decided that she should, and the clergy and their adherents immediately seceded, went to another place, and organized a society full of deadly hostility to the old one, giving it the name of the "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society." Their first endeavour was to brand the old society as a dangerous body; as one which ought to be discountenanced by every friend of good order and religion. This new clerical society, unfortunately, like Elliot Cresson and his mission, has taken root in England, and has obtained the warm support of the Broad-street Committee, in London, which, singularly enough, is composed principally of the Society of Friends, who profess to hold, as one of their fundamental principles, the right for every human being to speak as the spirit giveth utterance, and who authorize, to the utmost, the right of women to enter the ministry, and speak in public. But truth is strong, nay, omnipotent, and these things must in the end be corrected.

No one individual in America has come in for a greater share of hatred and misrepresentation from this new and adverse party, than Garrison himself. It has been their object to crush him, and the violence of the Southern slave party has not been greater than the unkind, ungenerous falsehoods which they have circulated against him. We have heard, all of us in England, that he is a disturber of the public peace, a firebrand, an infidel, and oh the last charge have the changes been most successfully rung. An infidel! because he believes that not *one* day in seven, but that *all* days should be kept holy! Are not many of us infidels in this same sense? A disorganizer and firebrand, because he rejects the use of all carnal weapons, and inculcates the duty of literally overcoming evil with good, and forgiving our enemies, as we desire God to forgive us! May the day soon come, when not only he, but we and the whole world, are "disorganizers and firebrands" of this description.

In 1840, the so-called "World's Anti-Slavery Convention" was held in London, and Garrison was appointed by the American Anti-Slavery Society to attend it, together with Lucretia Mott, and other female delegates—Lucretia Mott, by way of parenthesis, let us observe, is another of those remarkable women who have been called out of the retirement of private life, to stand forth boldly in this great battle of human rights. Never will the writer of this article forget seeing for the first time this extraordinary woman. Lucretia Mott, to her idea, must be an Amazon who, if full of intellectual power, and moral intrepidity, would want yet the graces of the true woman. She came; she was not above the middle size; in the plainest garb of a Quaker matron; calm, gentle, affectionate, and womanly in the highest degree. There was something absolutely subduing in the tenderness of her eye, in her soft smile, and low, pleasant voice; presently, however, the intellectual brow, the kindling eye, the beaming countenance, and the eloquent tongue realized an idea of intellectual and moral greatness, and singleness of purpose, which wanted no Amazonian figure to complete it. She is now the writer's idea of a woman of the apostolic age; and hers, in reality, are the true characteristics of mind which those apostolic days called forth, as well as the present great struggle in America. Such was Lucretia Mott; but she was a *woman*, and the World's Convention would not receive her; nor, of course, any of her sister delegates.

Garrison, as might be expected, refused, therefore, to appear in the character of delegate, either; not on the ground of "Woman's Right's," but because the credentials given by the American Anti-Slavery Society were dishonoured, and he would not allow himself to go in as a privileged member, where others, having the same credentials as his own, were excluded. To have done otherwise would, according to his views, have been false to that society, and to the cause of the slave. He went, therefore, merely into the gallery as a spectator.

Strong in many noble minds was the indignation felt at this exclusion, and Daniel O'Connell and William Howitt, each of them, addressed letters to Lucretia Mott on this subject which were widely circulated in America.

The great question of entire and immediate emancipation, since then, has made rapid progress through the United States. The true spirit of American independence is showing itself amongst accumulating thousands who have awoke as from a lethargy, and are exerting their strength to throw off this incubus of crime, and this moral disgrace, from their country.

The object of William Lloyd Garrison, and his colleagues, Henry C. Wright and Frederick Douglass, in this country at the present moment, is to rouse the sympathies of the British population, and, knowing the influence which public opinion here exerts in America, to secure for this sacred cause the full benefit of this moral agent.

The struggle is an arduous one, but the hand of God is for it, and it must prosper. Many remarkable features already attend it; it has called forth an amount of moral power and greatness, the effect of which cannot easily be calculated, but the result of which *must* be an immense march onward in the human progress.

Of our friend Garrison, let us conclude in the words of one capable of appreciating characters like his—"He is one of God's nobility—the head of the moral aristocracy. It is not only that he is invulnerable to injury—that he early got the world under his feet, but that in his meekness, his sympathies, his self-forgetfulness, he appears "covered all over with the stars and orders of the spiritual realm whence he derives his dignities and his powers." He is, in short, a true disciple of Christ, and in this lies his power and his greatness. Such men ennoble their age and their country.

Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

ATTEMPTED SALE OF A WIFE BY PUBLIC AUCTION, AT SHEFFIELD.—The town of Sheffield, which has now attained so unenviable a notoriety as being the seat of crime of the deepest magnitude, has this week added another and an unusual one to the catalogue, viz: the public tender of a wife by her husband. On Tuesday about mid-day, as the Mayor was wending his way to the Town Hall, he observed a large concourse of persons hurrying towards the Corn Exchange, near the cattle market. On inquiring, his Worship ascertained that the object of the movement was to witness the degrading spectacle of a wife being sold at public auction by her husband. He accordingly went into the Police Office and sent police-constable Woolhouse to apprehend all the parties concerned in it. Woolhouse forthwith proceeded to the market, where he found the unfortunate woman surrounded by a grinning and gaping multitude, consisting of some thousands of persons. The husband was then gone to fetch an acquaintance, or brother workman, who, by previous arrangement, was to become the purchaser. The woman was forthwith taken before the Mayor, and on being questioned as to the revolting affair, stated that her name was Harriet Trott, and that she had been married to Robert Trott, of Little Sheffield, labourer, twelve months last Christmas-day. They lived unhappily together, and she had once had him up before the Magistrates for ill-using her. Besides which, he had taken an extraordinary liking to one Mrs. Peters, who lodged in the same house. The husband had that morning threatened to take her life unless she consented to be sold in the market. She had, therefore, consented to be led there by her husband and another man, but did not know that any one would purchase her. She had, however, been told by her husband that she was to be sold to a man she did not know. The poor woman, who was under twenty-one years of age, wept bitterly while making this statement to the Magistrates. The Mayor ordered her to be detained until the following day, and forthwith issued warrants for the apprehension of her brutal husband, and his not much less brutal companion.—*Sheffield Iris.*

COVENT GARDEN ALTERATIONS.—The report that the alterations in progress had endangered the stability of the building has been most promptly and satisfactorily set at rest. We learn that the house has been remodeled and strengthened, with a view to "overflowing and enthusiastic audiences." The rumour of instability reminds us of an anecdote—sorry we are it is most authentic—of a "most respectable old lady" in the neighbourhood of Manchester. The new theatre had been built with great rapidity; and, in course of tea-table talk, it was suggested that possibly the structure might not be secure. "In that case, don't you think, my dear," said the aforesaid respectable old lady, "that it would be only proper first to try it,—I mean, fill it with *factory people*."—*Jerrold.*

We have to announce the death of Mr. Byng, one of the members for the county of Middlesex, and the oldest member of the House of Commons, who expired on Sunday afternoon, at his seat, Wrotham Hall, Middlesex, at the age of eighty-two. He was attached to the party which boasted the names of Fox, Grey, and Sheridan as its leaders and most renowned orators; he was the parliamentary colleague of such men as Pitt, Burke, Wilberforce, and Wyndham, and he acted with Grattan, Canning, Romilly, Brougham, Horner, Burdett, Whitebread, Erskine, Plunkett—with Lord John Russell and his friends—with Macintosh, Sheil, and O'Connell—with Villiers and Cobden—in fine, with all whose names are inscribed on the parliamentary roll for half a century, as having contributed to the abrogation of Slavery and the Slave-Trade, the amelioration of the criminal code, the accomplishment of Catholic Emancipation, the removal of the disabilities of the Dissenters, the effecting of parliamentary and municipal reform, and last, though not least of all, in the removal of restrictions on the freedom of commerce.

An American editor, in preparing Sterne's works for sale in the slave States, substitutes "oppression" for "Slavery"! "Disguise thyself as thou wilt, still, oppression, still thou art a bitter draught."

BLOODSHED AND BIBLES.—At New-York, it seems resolved that the war against Mexico shall be waged religiously. A Bible was presented to every soldier of the New-York legion, or California regiment, by the American Bible Society. The regiment was drawn up in hollow square, and Mr. M'Vicar distributed the books, beginning with the Colonel. The chaplain then exhorted them to "go not only with the sword, but with the olive branch of peace, and with that Bible upon which liberty has its foundation." The California regiment, with its Bibles invading the Mexican territory, is a curious accommodation to modern Anglo-Protestant sentiments, of the same propagando-conquering spirit which made Spanish monks, in the days of Cortes, march at the head of Spanish legions with their crucifixes.—These warriors are manifestly of the "Trust-in-God-and-keep-your-powder-dry" school.—*Jerrold.*

REMARKABLE ESCAPE OF FRENCH SLAVES.—On the 16th ultimo, four slaves from Martinique effected their landing in the British Island of St. Lucia, after pulling across the channel in a heavy flat-bottom boat, in about thirty-six hours. During their passage they were alarmed by the appearance of the French Guarda-Costa *Mésange*, and apprehending she was in pursuit of them they pulled away considerably to windward, and were finally driven ashore on the rocks at Espérance Point perfectly exhausted. It is miraculous, how these four men could have succeeded in coming so great a distance in such a frail vessel.—*Barbadoes Liberal.*

The Queen's ship, *Kingfisher*, Commander Wilmot Horton, took two slavers on the coast of Africa, within a fortnight of his assuming the command, on September 21st.

A deserter from the 33d lately cut off his trigger-finger with a razor in Tullamore jail. This is now a common thing in Russia, and was so in France during Napoleon's conscriptions.

The Pope has abolished the custom of kissing the cross on his slipper, commonly called "kissing the Pope's toe;" and, instead, extends his hand to be kissed.

The *Dumfries Courier* observes that what was said of a writer of long epitaphs might be applied to President Polk's Message:

One half will never be believed,
The other never read.

The King of Prussia has conferred the decoration of the Black Eagle on Baron Alexandre de Humbolt.

SUBSCRIPTION FOR IRELAND.—A subscription has been commenced in good earnest. Among the names and sums already advertised are:—The Queen, 2,000*l.*; Prince Albert, 500*l.*; The Duchess of Gloucester, 200*l.*; The Duke of Devonshire, 1,000*l*; Messrs. Baring, Brothers, and Co. 1,000*l.*; Messrs. Jones Loyd, and Co. 1,000*l.*; Messrs. Overend, Gurney, and Co. 1,000*l.*; Messrs. Rothschild and Co. 1,000*l.*; Messrs. Smith, Payne, and Smiths, 1,000*l*; Messrs. Truman, Hanbury, and Buxton, 1,000*l.*; Lord John Russell, 300*l.*; Subscriptions of 200*l.* have also been received from Sir Robert Peel and several other gentlemen. The exertions of the Society of Friends we have noticed in another part.

A society has been established, with Lord Ashley at the head, for "the purpose of providing free reading rooms for the labouring classes in the city of London."

The subscription of the Society of Friends in this country, for the relief of the suffering Irish, averages more than £5 from each family, rich and poor.

MRS. BAL